UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The Cultural and Religious Significance of Japanese Buddhist Vestments

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in East Asian Languages and Cultures

by

Diane Elizabeth Riggs

2010

© Copyright by

Diane Elizabeth Riggs

2010

The dissertation of Diane Elizabeth Riggs is approved

Robert E. Buswell, Jr.

Michael F. Marra

Donald F. McCallum

William M. Bodiford, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2010

For Sakai Joshin, who showed the way

And for Suzuki Mitsu, who showed the heart of Buddhist life

Table of Contents

Abbreviations v

Introduction 1

1. The Buddhist Robe according to the Dharma: *Nyohō e* 13

2. Ancient Textiles and Artistic Representation of the Multi-color Pieced *Kesa* 51

3. The Merit of the Robe as Depicted in Medieval Literature 106

4. The "Robe in Accord with the *Dharma*" in the Tokugawa Period 148

5. Development of Sōtō Zen Orthodoxies in Regard to the *Kesa* 221

Conclusion 306

Works Cited 320

Abbreviations

BD — *Bukkyō daijiten* 佛教大辞典. 10 vols. Edited by Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨. Sekai Seiten Kankō Kyōkai, 1933-1936; 1958-1963.

DDZ — *Dengyō daishi zenshō*. 傳教大師全集. 5 vols. Edited by Hieizan Senshuin nai Eizan Gakuin. 比叡山専修院内叡山學院. Tokyo: Tendaishū Shūten Kankōkai, 1912.

DNB — *Dai Nihon Bukkyō zensho* 大日本佛教全書. 100 vols. Edited by Bussho Kankōkai 佛書刊行會, 1912-1922. revised by Suzuki Gakujutsu Zaidan 鈴木学術財団. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1972-1975.

DZZ — *Dōgen zenji zenshū* 道元禅師全集. 2 vols. Edited by Ōkubo Dōshū 大久保道舟. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobō, 1969-1970.

IBK — *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku kenkyū.*

JIABS — *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies.*

JSZ — *Jiun Sonja zenshū*. 慈雲尊者全集. 19 vols. Edited by Hase Hōshū 長谷寶秀. Kyōto: Shibun kaku, 1974 (1922-26).

NKBT — *Nihon koten bungaku taikei* 日本古典文学大系. 100 vols. and index 2 vols. Iwanami Shoten, 1957-1967.

T — *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 100 vols. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎 and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭. Tokyo: Daizō kyōkai, 1924-1935.

SSZ — *Sōtō shū zensho* 曹洞宗全書. 20 vols. Edited by Sōtō shū zensho kankōkai 曹洞宗全書刊行會. Tokyo: Sōtō shū kankōkai.

ZGD *Zengaku Daijiten* 禪學大辞典. Komazawa Daigakunai Zengaku Dai Jiten Hensanjo, ed. 駒澤大学禪學大辞典編纂所. Tokyo: Taishukan Shoten, 1978.

ZSSZ *Zoku Sōtō shū zensho* 続曹洞宗全書. Edited by Sōtōshū Zensho Kankōkai 曹洞宗全書刊行會. Tokyo: Sōtōshū Shūmuchō, 1974-1977.

ZZGR *Zokuzoku Gunsho ruijū* 續々群諸類従. 17 vols. Zoku Gunsho Ruiju Kanseikai 續群諸類縦完成会. 1969-1970. Also, earlier edition published by Kokusho Kankōkai 国書刊行會. 1906-1909.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the Aratani Fieldwork Fellowship from the Center for Japanese Studies at UCLA for support of my preliminary fieldwork in Japan and the Numata Fellowship for Advanced Research at Ryūkoku University, Kyoto which supported me for two years of study under the guidance of Professor Myōsei Tatsuguchi.

My deepest thanks to Professor William Bodiford whose meticulous, patient, and insightful guidance through the process of writing up my research helped me to clarify my argument and see its broader implications. Professor Robert Buswell generously provided the opportunity to begin this process, and his perceptive guidance was invaluable. Professor Donald McCallum's clear and detailed observations were a tremendous help, especially the sections that dealt with art. Professor Michael Marra supported and inspired the literary aspects of the dissertation.

Many people in Japan deserve special thanks for providing numerous opportunites for my research, and for their patience in helping me understand the results. Professor Tatsuguchi Myōsei read often abstruse works on *kesa* with me and provided opportunities for presenting my research in seminars and public meetings at Ryūkoku University, Kyoto as well as at the conference of the Japanese International Association of Buddhist Studies in Tokyo, 2006. His enthusiasm for my topic and his interest in the intersection between Buddhism and culture helped shape my research. .Professor Kazuhiko Komatsu of the International Center for Japanese Studies provided an intellectual and physical home base for me to do my fieldwork. Matsumura Kaoruku generously introduced me to *kesa* sewing groups and supported me as a colleague in our mutual research interests. My thanks also to four Sōtō Zen teachers: Kyūma Echū and Okamoto Kōbun, who accepted me into the *kesa* sewing workshops at Jōshukuji, Yamaguchi Dōnen of Kenshōji, and Hiranō Shōshun

of Myōgenji, who patiently taught me about the history, practice, and mental attitude of sewing robes. Kuruma Shōgyō, abbot of Kannon'in in Musashisakai also gave me intellectual and material support at his temple where he maintains *kesa* sewing practice for ordained and lay people. I especially wish to thank Soeno Chigo, abbot of the Shingon temple, Daimonji, who helped me conduct the survey of participants in the 200 year memorial of Jiun and provided help in digitizing the results. Through these diverse contacts I had several opportunities to study *kesa* stored at Kōkiji and Chōeiji.

At the heart of the matter is the practice of sewing *kesa* which was brought to America in the early 1970s by two Sōtō Zen nuns, Yoshida Eshun and Sakai Joshin. Their dedication and joy in sewing the Buddha's robe led me to embark on this research. Suzuki Mitsu, widow of the founder of San Francisco Zen Center, Suzuki Shunryū, taught me Japanese sewing, tea ceremony, and the lively spirit of a Buddhist life, invaluable lessons for my fieldwork. In the end, though, it is the tenacious and insightful support of my husband, David Riggs, who read many drafts and patiently listened to my ideas over dinner after long days of translating and writing, that made this dissertation come alive.

VITA

October 18, 1949	Born in Mineola, New York.
1973	B.A. English University of California, Berkeley, California
1973-1976	Zen monastic training at Tassajara Zen Mountain Center Carmel Valley, California
1976-1986	Manager of sewing business, and Director of meditation hall San Francisco Zen Center, San Franciscio, California
1987-1989	Postgraduate work in Japanese language and Asian studies University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan
1989-1993	Tokyo, Japan
1992-1993	Advanced Japanese language training at Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies at Yokohama, Japan Highest level (N1) of Japanese Language Proficiency Test, 1993
1994-1998	Teaching Assistant at UCLA, Los Angeles, California
1998	M.A. Japanese Studies and Buddhist Studies UCLA Los Angeles, California
2001	Instructor for Japanese Civilization at UCLA
2002-03	Fieldwork under Aratani Fieldwork Fellowship, Center for Japanese Studies, UCLA. International Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto, Japan
2004-2007	Dissertation Research under Numata Fellowship for Advanced Research, at Ryūkoku University, Kyoto, Japan (2005-2007).
2009	Visiting Assistant Professor, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Riggs, Diane E. "Hand-sewn Buddhist Robes in Contemporary Japan and the Rhetoric of Authenticity." International Center for Japanese Studies, Kyoto. September 4, 2004.

------. "Fukudenkai: Sewing the Buddha's robe in Contemporary Japanese Buddhist practice." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 31, no. 2 (2004): 315-360.

Riggs, Diane. "The Material of the *Kesa*: Rag Robes and Daoxuan's prohibition of silk." Paper presented at the conference of Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies, Taishō University, Tokyo. September 13, 2006.

------. "Robes of Rags and Silk in the Edo Period:Menzan Zuihō and Ueda Shōhen Interpret the Practice of the Buddhist Robe." *Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 55 (2006): 1161-1166.

------. "Shaping Aesthetic Response to the Buddhist Robe." Presentation given at Oberlin Symposium: "Dressing up Japanese History: Gender, Class, and Clothing from Premodern to Present." Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. September 8, 2007.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Cultural and Religious Significance of Japanese Buddhist Vestments

by

Diane Elizabeth Riggs

Doctor of Philosophy in East Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2010

Professor William M. Bodiford, Chair

Buddhist literature attributes the origin of monks' robes to the historical Buddha. The robes are thus imbued with the wisdom of the Buddha. Indian monastic codes distinguished between the ascetic practice of wearing robes made from discarded rags picked up from the road, and the the monastic practice of wearing robes made from donated cloth. As Buddhism spread, robes were adapted to different cultures, often with minimal reference to monastic codes. The history of this adaptation in Japan, the subject of this research, is revealed by investigating examples of garments, depictions of robes in Buddhist art, and a rich literary tradition about the spiritual power of the robe.

The form of both rag robes and monastic robes changed in East Asia. Robes sewn from colorful pieces of fabric imitated robes made of discarded rags. In Japan, such robes were used in rituals for the preservation of the state, given as gifts to the monarch, and preserved at the treasury of the eighth century monarch, Shōmu and other temples. Portraits of eminent Buddhist teachers depict them wearing these multi-colored robes. The monastic robe also changed as Buddhist clerics at court were required to wear robes in the

color of their court rank rather than the subdued colors prescribed by monastic codes.

Seventeenth century reformers attempted to reshape Japanese Buddhist robes to fit the prescriptions of ancient monastic codes. The Shingon Buddhist teacher, Jiun Onkō, supplemented this kind of textual study by examining art and ancient robes. He taught his followers to make monastic robes according to the codes, and robes that he identified as "rag robes," using the ancient multi-colored pieced robes preserved in Japan as a model. The monastic and rag robes made by Jiun's followers inspired the twentieth century Sōtō Zen priest, Sawaki Kōdō, to popularize sewing robes. Following the teachings of Dōgen, the founder of Sōtō Zen, Sawaki encouraged lay and ordained men and women to sew and wear their own robes as a return to fundamental Buddhist practice, an approach at odds with the customs of Sōtō Zen.

The interdisciplinary approach of this dissertation reveals the dynamic interplay between text, art, and textiles that created a vibrant material culture of Japanese Buddhist vestments.

Introduction

Since the sixth century when Buddhism was introduced to the Japanese islands, Buddhist garments have provided a fertile ground for the interplay between material expression and religious belief. Inheriting a tradition that was already a thousand years in the making, Japanese Buddhists followed a trajectory of adapting and interpreting the Buddhist robe that began with the earliest practice communities. Buddhist robes are garments for the body, but they are also the expression of the religious imagination seen in teachings and ritual practices. The Buddhist robe is thus a potent world of meaning that has been continually renewed by Buddhist communities of the past and present.

The twenty five hundred year tradition of interpreting the meaning of Buddhist garments provides a rich source of material for understanding the nature of dress in human culture. Early Buddhist communities arose in a religious culture where any clothing at all was viewed as optional. Buddhist texts attribute the adoption of robes as a way to distinguish themselves from other ascetic groups. For example, certain strands of Jainism, in many ways similar in doctrines and practices of Buddhism, promoted a form of naked asceticism. Buddhists claimed that certain uses of their robes were an ascetic practice. The fact that both wearing and not wearing clothes were claimed as an ascetic practice suggests that asceticism may have had less to do with physical privation than is usually thought. This is one example among many where the study of Buddhist clothing provides a new perspective into the role of dress in human culture. Several hundred years after the death of the Buddha, around the beginning of the common era, when monastic regulations were first codified and recorded, Buddhists had already developed a complex social and ritual world of making, bestowing, receiving and wearing robes. Because this Buddhist sartorial tradition so deliberately and self-consciously explores the meaning of clothing in a religious context it provides a large body of data that will interest scholars of

cultural dress theory as well as religious studies.

Just as scriptures were translated as Buddhism moved into different cultures, Buddhist garments also had to be translated into the sartorial vernacular of each culture. The Japanese obtained the Buddhist robe through successive importations of garments and texts from the East Asian continent. These continental cultures had mediated both the physical garments and their representation in sculpture and painting as well as the translation and interpretation of Buddhist literature concerning the robe. The actual physical garments and their artistic representation were introduced before the texts, so these artifacts were the foundation. Actual garments and art works depicting garments are similar to texts in their ability to project an ideal of the Buddhist robe as it was worn during the lifetime of Śākyamuni Buddha. The concrete details of physical materials, color and structure of the garment as well as its use and meaning for Buddhist monks can be expressed in artifact, artistic representation and textual prescription and interpretation. Buddhist robes are thus a product of a dynamic between these three modes and I have attempted to give equal weight to each without privileging one over the other.

This approach is made more difficult by a revisionary strain that runs through the textual tradition of the Buddhist robe. When texts classify adaptations of the Buddhist robes as unorthodox they place themselves at the top of a hierarchy of significance. Revisionary texts often take a tone of reproach toward contemporary cultural forms, rejecting these forms as inconsistent with the true form of the Buddhist robe and identifying the indigenous robe culture as inferior to the original foreign culture.

Reformers of robe practice in Japan found their ultimate authority in monastic codes. If the goal is to reproduce the same type of garments that Śākyamuni wore, however, these monastic codes, which began to be written down nearly five hundred years after the death of the Buddha, can at best express an ideal of the Buddhist life. To

take them literally as an accurate picture of the practice of the robe during the life of the Buddha misses one of the greatest teachings they have to offer: how do Buddhists adapt and evolve the ideals of the religion to address present social and cultural conditions? The codes, which were translated into Chinese over a period of several centuries, continued to be at the center of a process of cultural modification. In the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, when monastic codes were most assiduously studied in Japan, criticism of contemporary practices of the Buddhist robe was severe. On the other hand, the fact that this era of self-consciousness came more than a thousand years after the introduction of Buddhism to the Yamato court makes clear the crucial role that artifacts and art had played in shaping the native conception of the Buddhist robe, and the fairly minor role of monastic codes through most of Japanese Buddhist history.

Another problematic area is the relationship between text and artistic representation. Aspects of the physical garment, for example, stitching lines, that are prescribed in monastic codes were depicted in art. It is tempting, perhaps, to conclude that artists followed the text, but one could equally say that the artist followed the actual garments or other artistic representations. Each case must be taken on its own terms and without solid documentation it is difficult to make a decisive case for either artifact, art or text being the dominant influence on how garments were represented. The evidence that I will present suggests that the culture in which the art was produced valued these physical aspects so much that the artist meticulously represented the details in paintings and sculpture. In addition to the facial expression and physical shape the depiction of the robes in painting or the drapery of the statue provides a wealth of information about the place of this figure in the Buddhist world.

The Buddhist robe has attracted little interest from Western scholars until the last fifteen years. Most of the studies are short articles, not full-length works. A few early

works treat the robe as part of a larger religious cultural context, such as Johannes Prip-Møller's (1937) study of Chinese Buddhist monasteries and Alan Priest's (1935) museum catalogue for a display of Buddhist and Noh garments at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. In 1957 Chang Kun published his study of the *kaṭhinavastu*, a compilation of texts that prescribe rules for the ancient ritual offering of cloth from the laity to the monks after the rainy season retreat and the subsequent period of sewing robes. The *kaṭhina* ceremony is still practiced in Southeast Asian Buddhism as well as in Western countries where Southeast Asian Buddhist centers have been established. Chang's composite translation offers a glimpse into the procedures for making the robes, including the prescription that the leader of the sewing project should make a threefold resolution for each stage of the process from receiving the cloth to washing, dyeing, measuring, cutting, basting and sewing the robes. In spite of the fact that this is still a living practice, Chang's study remains the only one of its kind.

There was no thorough attempt to understand the manner of wearing Buddhist robes until Alexander Griswold's study of drapery on Buddhist statues in 1963. Griswold sought to counter the criticism that artistic representations were necessarily inaccurate depictions of the garments that the Buddha had worn. He undertook the problem of reconciling the apparent discrepancies between the garments worn by contemporary Theravādin monks and the apparently sleeved Buddhist garments as depicted in Chinese art. Concluding that what appeared to be sleeves were in fact drapery he laid out the idealistic premise of his approach: "Both magic and common sense required every Buddha image to be a copy of an older one, purportedly tracing back through no matter how many removes to an original made in India by some artist who was perfectly acquainted with the Buddha's Person" (Griswold 1963, 85). Griswold used Isaline B. Horner's translations of Pali monastic regulations as a basis for understanding the fundamentals of how the robes were worn, and then interviewed contemporary monks to

correct or confirm his understanding, expressing no awareness of the problems of this methodology.

In spite of its uncritical character, Griswold's study stood for three decades as the only serious study of the Buddhist robe until the publication of several articles during the 1990s by scholars who approached the robe as a textile: first, Alan Kennedy's (1993) study of Japanese *kesa* 袈裟, followed by Barry Till and Paula Swart's (1997) study. Kennedy's work opened up the study of Japanese robes and his descriptions of the textiles were used by later scholars. Kennedy presents a chronological, developmental model for understanding the *kesa* in Japanese historical context. His account is marred, however, by the assumption that ancient garments are more authentic than those worn in later periods. This bias confuses his descriptions of both the construction and the religious meaning of the garments. Kennedy also appears to be limited to English language sources.

Studies of the religious and symbolic aspects of the Buddhist robe also appeared during the 1990s. Bernard Faure (1994), using Kennedy for a description of the physical robe, interpreted the symbolism of the robe. He used an unpublished work of Anna Seidel (written in 1983; published in 2003) about the similarity between Chinese Buddhist attitudes toward the robe and the theme of dynastic treasure in Chinese culture. Faure also incorporated the work of the Japanese Buddhist scholar Ishikawa Rikizan 石川力山 (1985) about Sōtō Zen initiation documents (*kirikami* 切り紙) concerning the Buddhist robe as a symbolic map of the spiritual universe (*maṇḍala*). Faure's work was a great advance because he was able to use Japanese sources. John Kieschnik (1999), building on Faure's article, discussed the symbolism of the monk's robe in China: transmission accounts, the purple robe bestowed on the eminent monk, symbolic interpretations of the number of strips that made up the garment and other aspects. Faure and Kieschnik's work at last brought the Buddhist robe into religious studies. Their

purpose was not to construct an overall model for understanding the Buddhist robe. Rather, in their work the robe is treated as a symbolic object without analysis of its function in the history of Buddhism or as a garment in daily religious practice and ritual. From the point of view of religious studies, a more useful approach is that taken by John Strong (2004) who analyzes the meaning of the Buddhist robe as an aspect of relic veneration, an ancient and fundamental aspect of Buddhist piety.

At the beginning of the new century, important textual studies of the Buddhist robe have helped to rectify this problem. Wendy Adamek's study (2000) picked up one of the references cited by Seidel for further investigation. She analyzed how the rhetoric of transmission and the bestowal of the robe became part of a legitimation strategy in Chan. By clarifying the political connections implicit in this rhetoric Adamek points out an important dynamic in East Asian attitudes towards the Buddhist robe. Koichi Shinohara's (2000) study uses a description of the robe in a vision recorded in a seventh century Chinese encyclopedia of Buddhism, *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠琳. This vision, said to have been dreamed by Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667), the Chinese master of monastic codes, in the last year of his life, offers an eschatological tale about the power of the robe to preserve and propagate the Buddhist teaching in times of persecution. Antonino Forte's (2001) article about the ruler's bestowal of the purple robe on worthy clerics uses meticulous textual work to correct misperceptions about this practice in East Asian Buddhism. Forte found that the first occasion of the bestowal of the purple robe was concerned with court protocol and only later became a sign of the ruler's approval for favors done by the priests. Finally, Jonathan Silk (2003) published a detailed article that clarifies the various accounts in Pali, Sanskrit and Chinese Buddhist literature of an exchange of robes between Śākyamuni Buddha and his disciple, Mahākāśyapa. Most of these careful textual studies, however, are focused on Chinese sources and religious concerns, with limited reference to Indian sources.

The earliest treatment of the Buddhist robe in an encyclopedia format is contained in the article on "clothing" Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (1908-1926). By far the most careful and concise depiction of the Buddhist robe is Willa Tanabe's (2003) article in the *Encyclopedia of Buddhism.* None of the foregoing studies, however, comprise more than forty pages, and the wealth of original materials and secondary sources in Japanese has barely been touched. Most studies leave the physical description of Buddhist robes in the hands of textile historians who do not read primary Buddhist sources and rely on translations of secondary sources. Only Griswold's study, in spite of its lack of critical distance, manages a more holistic approach that incorporates art, text and living informants. The result is that errors in these descriptions and unexamined assumptions about the meaning of the garments continue to be perpetuated in other scholar's works.

This dissertation is the first full-length work in English on the religious significance and the practice of the Buddhist robe in Japan. The methodology that I have developed over the course of this research coordinates data from ancient artifacts, art and textual sources. The synergy between these three modes drives the religious meaning of the Buddhist robe in Japan, making it a vital practice that continues to evolve. The contradictions and ambiguities between textual prescriptions and robe practice stimulate the growing point of the religion where the process of adoption and transformation takes place. Similarly, the depiction of the robe in art presents an ideal that can be immediately perceived and provides information that is very difficult to convey through text. As my research will show, these artistic depictions have inspired faith in the robe as well as challenged people's ideas about what the authentic robe is.

In the first chapter I discuss the different authorities on which the ideal robe is based. I introduce the term *nyohō e* 如法衣, which means "the robe that accords with

the *dharma*." In Japanese Buddhist literature this term appears in many different contexts with different meanings. I avoid translating this term as orthodox, which brings its own freight from other contexts. This chapter introduces three paradigms of the Buddhist robe in regard to physical form: the rag robe that is the mark of ascetic practice, the monastic robe that was developed by settled monastic and lay communities and the golden robe that is closely associated with the Buddha. These three models of the physical robe at times appear to be distinct, but at other times the borders between them dissolve. I also introduce a distinction between the ritually defined rag robe and a type of monastic robe that is made from colored bits of cloth called the multi-colored pieced robe. This distinction is particularly important for understanding the ancient *kesa* textiles found in Japan and the lineage of robes that they inspired. Finally, I discuss the implications of the disjunction between the set of three robes as prescribed in the monastic codes and the reality of Japanese robe practice where a single rectangular *kesa* is worn over a set of sleeved robes derived from Chinese and Japanese garments.

In the second chapter I introduce ancient *kesa* artifacts and artworks that have played a significant role in the imagination of the multi-colored pieced robe in Japanese thought and practice. The ancient *kesa* textiles come from collections at major temples in Japan that date to the eighth century. Beginning in the ninth century these *kesa* began to acquire textual histories that became more and more elaborate as time went on. These histories had the effect of identifying certain *kesa* textiles as important treasures, and as these *kesa* began to be included in public exhibitions during the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, they came to be seen as important treasures of the Japanese nation. For examples in art, I use important cultural icons that reveal how the portrayal of the multi-colored pieced *kesa* contributes to the meaning of the figure that is depicted. This chapter also investigates the blurring of the distinction between the two paradigms of the rag robe and the monastic multi-colored pieced robe during the nineteenth century. The

premodern terminology used to refer to these robes indicates that they were originally understood to be a form of monastic robes. The distinction between these two kinds of robes was maintained, at least by custom if not by understanding, until the late nineteenth century when the distinction was lost.

The third chapter turns toward texts in order to discuss beliefs concerning the power of the *kesa* to overcome hindrances in practice, including being born in an impure world or in the period of the degeneration of the *dharma*. The texts in this chapter date from the late Heian through Muromachi period. Tale literature reveals a pattern of ambivalence toward the robe. The Buddhist robe is a force for good as it is believed to have the power to protect the wearer, but on the other hand, the robe may disguise those with evil intent. Another theme is the role that the robe assumes during the age of the degenerate *dharma* as portrayed by the compilation, *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma.* In an era when not even monks can keep the precepts, the Buddhist robe becomes the lone signifier of the Buddhist monk. In this text as well, both positive and negative views of the *kesa* are voiced. Finally, I discuss the appeal of the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* during the twelfth to fourteenth centuries and its teaching of the five virtues of the *kesa* based on the vows made in a former life of Śākyamuni Buddha. The vows imbue the *kesa* with the power to allow a wavering monk to at last achieve awakening, but they also promise more mundane benefits such as freedom from hunger and protection in battle. The beliefs developed during this period continue to have a role in contemporary Buddhist practice.

The fourth chapter is concerned with the changing understanding of the Buddhist robe in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries. During this period, in part because of the encouragement of the government, scholar-monks began a serious study of monastic codes and sought to put into practice its teachings about the monastic robe. At first the

reformers envisioned a transformation of Japanese Buddhist practice in which monks would follow the same code of behavior, including dress, while retaining the teachings of their individual schools. During the mid-eighteenth century, however, increasing sectarianism erased this dream and the reformers themselves were viewed as subsets within each school. Despite this, the Shingon cleric, Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718-1804) continued to work towards the goal of one monastic robe that would unite at least the practice of the robe. Jiun's project of making one thousand *kesa* that conformed to the prescriptions of the monastic codes was undertaken by his disciples and lay followers. Over a period of forty years nuns, court ladies and local wives sewed *kesa* according to Jiun's instructions in his monumental studies of the *kesa*. Perhaps more than any other act, this project produced an unprecedented level of knowledge of the *kesa* in lay believers, and inspired twentieth century Sōtō Zen clerics and lay people to learn about the *kesa*.

The fifth chapter addresses the question of how the Sōtō Zen school developed its own interpretation of the "robe according to the *dharma*" during the eighteenth to twentieth centuries. Due to the emphasis on Dōgen as the source of authority, Sōtō Zen scholar-monks had to decide to what degree the gaps in Dōgen's descriptions could be supplemented with monastic codes. I compare the writings of two scholar monks who answer this question in very different ways. Unlike reformers in other schools who did not seek institutional change, when disagreements arose concerning Dōgen's view of the Buddhist robe, it threatened the institutional integrity of the Sōtō Zen school. Conflicting interpretations of the Buddhist robe developed into a bitter dispute between rival temples in the middle of the nineteenth century and had to be resolved by the Tokugawa bakufu. The compromise achieved in the late nineteenth century resulted in a code of dress that was dictated by committees and compromise, not scholarship and custom. The movement to bring Sōtō robes closer to the prescriptions of monastic codes did not,

however, completely die out. In the twentieth century this aspiration re-emerged with the efforts of Sawaki Kōdō 澤木興道 (1880-1965) and Hashimoto Ekō 橋本恵光 (1890-1965). The new form of the movement presented the practice of sewing robes as a religious practice and was closely connected with groups of dedicated clerics and lay people who sat zazen and sewed their own robes.

By concentrating on the dynamics of the religious significance of Japanese Buddhist robes in texts, art, and artifact, this research presents new material in an analytical framework that contributes to Buddhist studies and religious studies generally. I hope that this research will inspire scholars of other religions to investigate the dynamics of their own sartorial traditions. Janet Mayo's (1984) study of ecclesiastical dress in the Catholic church is one study, but there is considerable scope for analyzing the basic patterns of religious garments, especially as these religions move from one culture to another.

As this study will show, the movement of Buddhist robes between individuals, states, cultures and generations in Japan affected its religious and social value. The garments and art discussed in this dissertation have complex and fluid histories that reveal patterns of adaptation of the robe in Japanese Buddhist religious culture. For example, the *kesa* artifact regarded as the one that Saichō received as a mark of transmission of the *dharma* was apparently forgotten, then rediscovered some five hundred years later, again forgotten, and again rediscovered in the modern period. In the case of the Śākyamuni *kesa*, literary treatments of Prince Shōtoku's life resulted in the discovery of the corresponding *kesa* artifact. Portraits that depict Shōtoku wearing *kesa* usually depict a *kesa* of the same category as this artifact. Each of these examples involve a reinterpretation and re-evaluation of the meaning of the *kesa*. I make no claims about direct influence nor do I establish the provenance or authenticity of these garments.

My dissertation research focuses instead on the meanings attached to these garments in each of these cycles of revaluation. Texts and art are similarly subject to reassessments of their meaning. For example, in his own time, the impact of Dōgen's works on the *kesa* are insignificant compared to the influence of tale literature and other Buddhist works. Dōgen's thoughts on the *kesa* only become part of the conversation about Buddhist robes in the eighteenth century when Dōgen's work is rediscovered by scholar-monks in the Sōtō lineage.

The Buddhist robe is not just a material form. As an imagined ideal of life in the presence of Śākyamuni Buddha, the robe accompanies spiritual renewal and rededication in rituals of consecration. In Japan, these rituals include *dharma* transmission, ordination, and conferring robes on the laity. The robe also acquired a rich literary identity that was instrumental in adapting the robe to Japanese culture. This literary form of the robe seen in tale literature and other Buddhist writings uses the robe to explore ambivalent attitudes as well as religious aspiration towards Buddhism. Legendary histories about important Japanese religious figures also affected the value of historical *kesa* and spurred rediscovery of the artifacts of these teachers. This interplay between material form and religious ideal, which is a fundamental aspect of Buddhism, produced a vibrant material culture in Japan, of which the robe is one example.

These patterns of meaning of the Buddhist robe in Japan are revealed only by investigating texts, *kesa*, and artistic representations in their historical context. This study therefore utilizes and has implications for scholarship in art history, textile history, and literature as well as Buddhist studies and religious studies.

Chapter 1

The Buddhist Robe According to the Dharma: *Nyohō e*

The aspiration to wear garments that resemble those worn by the Buddha and his disciples has been a driving force behind reforms of the Buddhist robe that reached its full expression during the Tokugawa period (1603-1867). During this period Buddhist writers in the major schools produced treatises on the textual prescriptions of the garments found in monastic codes. The reformers focused primarily on the *kesa* 袈裟 (*kaṣāya*), a rectangular garment worn wrapped around the body. Japanese Buddhist practice follows customs begun in China, where the Indian monastic outfit of three rectangular garments was replaced by the practice of wearing one of these robes over ordinary Chinese clothing. Contemporary Japanese Sōtō clerics involved in the practice of sewing *kesa* often illustrate the effect of cultural change on Buddhist outfits by pointing to their layers of garments: a rectangular *kesa* from India, the Chinese style robe called the *jikitotsu* 直綴, the Japanese style *kimono* 着物 and Western underwear.[1] The push for reform is never so extreme as to reject the Chinese-style clothing, although some reformers argue for a more ancient version of these garments. This means that the energy for reform is almost entirely focused on the *kesa*, for this is the only garment that remains of the original Indian monastic outfit, and therefore offers the only opportunity for approaching the form of garments worn by the Buddha.

The reformers championed the ideal of wearing the "robe according to the Dharma," *nyohō e* 如法衣. This term is based on *vinaya*, the monastic rules literature that was composed from 100 BCE to 400 CE, at the earliest, nearly five hundred years after the Buddha lived (Nakamura 1989, 51-52).[2] It would be a mistake, however, to think of *vinaya* texts as establishing a single set of consistent rules that clearly define Buddhist garments for all time. Rather, the rules for clothing, which cover a fairly wide

range of social practices, suggest that compilers of the *vinaya* worked hard to accommodate diverse cultural and physical situations. The Buddhist robe as portrayed in the *vinaya* encompassed practices that were characteristic of both the settled life of the monastics and that of wandering ascetics. These monastic codes thus present an ethos of Buddhist clothing that was expressed in the practices of many diverse groups.

The variations of form allowed by the *vinaya* could be quite confusing to Japanese reformers. During the Tokugawa period studies of the *vinaya* proliferated, partly through the enthusiasm of *vinaya* revivalists, and partly due to the support of the government. In regard to the *kesa,* Tokugawa writers attempted to reconcile nearly two thousand years of history and cultural change to arrive at a description of the robe "in accord with the dharma." This Tokugawa period research in turn provided the authority for forms established by the Sōtō Zen teachers, Sawaki and Hashimoto Ekō, who promoted the practice of sewing what they termed *nyohō e* among lay and ordained Sōtō Zen believers in the twentieth century. The term *nyohō e* as used by *kesa* sewing practitioners usually refers exclusively to the form of the robe taught by Sawaki and Hashimoto, but participants have a limited understanding of the origin, meaning and the polemical uses of the term.

In this chapter I briefly describe the competing authorities that define *nyohō e* in contemporary Japan. The *vinaya* functions among these communities as a kind of touchstone. In the next section I identify and discuss three major paradigms of the Buddhist robe that can be seen in the *vinaya* and in other Buddhist literature: first, the ascetic's robe made from rags; second, the monastic's robe made from donated fabric; and third, the Buddha's robe made with golden thread. In some circumstances these three patterns appear to be quite distinct, but there are teachings that blur their distinctions and negotiate among them.

Part 1. The concept of *nyohō e*

The term *nyohō* (according with the Dharma) is defined in the *vinaya* as follows: "[the term] 'in accord with Dharma' means being in accord with Dharma, in accord with rules, in accord with what Buddhas teach" (*nyohō sha nyohō nyoritsu nyo butsu shokyō* 如法者、如法如律如佛所教; fascs. 5 and 18; T 22.599c and 685b). This definition functions as a stock phrase that is repeated many times throughout the text (e.g., 717a-718a, 720a-b,751b, 751c, 752a, 758b, 801b, 806b, 1013a). In this context, *Dharma* encompasses rules (*nyoritsu* 如律) governing material aspects of the monks' lives as well as the ethical and religious teachings of the Buddhas (*nyo butsu shokyō* 如佛所教). In Japanese Zen Buddhism, the authority for what is *nyohō* may be based on *vinaya* sources or on Zen monastic rules (*shingi* 清規), but texts are not the only source of the definition of what is according to the teaching. In Japanese Buddhism the term was appropriated by both the Shingon monastic teachings school (*Shingon risshū* 眞言律宗) and by the Zen school to refer to ideals, rules and customs specific to each school.[3]

In modern Japan the authority for *nyohō e* varies according to the perspective of the speaker. While Buddhist scholars are likely to consider primarily textual sources and the forms that developed in Japan within the so-called *vinaya* branches of the Shingon and Jōdo 浄土 schools, this kind of knowledge is limited to a small group and is not intended as a guideline for practice. In contrast, practitioners of *kesa* sewing in Sōtō Zen view Sawaki and Hashimoto's explanations of the *kesa* as *nyohō e* and apply it to their own practice, but have little awareness of how these particular forms have been adapted and synthesized from a variety of textual sources.

Perhaps one of the most important issues is how robe practice is taught to the next generation. For young monks in training, appropriate dress is prescribed by the training temple. Although this does not exclude following *vinaya* rules, these practices are more

likely to be based on oral teachings and customs passed on at training temples and the practice of one's teacher than on the *vinaya*.[4] These early influences are important in establishing the continuity of each tradition. Training temples, however, exercise a light control over the forms of the robes, leaving the practical details of the form of the robes to commercial robe makers.[5]

Recently, influenced to some degree by the popularity of the hand-sewn *nyohō e* robes of *kesa* sewing groups, commercial robe makers have begun to market garments that they define as *nyohō e*, adapting forms of Shingon and Sōtō Zen robes to commercial production methods. These commercial robe makers have taken an educational role at least since the early twentieth century. Kaen Eichō 花圓映澄 (fl. 1926) and Izutsu Gafū 井筒雅風 (fl. 1965), both of whom headed commercially successful robe manufacturing businesses, produced studies of the *kesa* and other garments as portrayed in *vinaya* materials as well as in historical records of Japanese Buddhist garments. In contemporary Japan it is not uncommon for commercial robe makers to include explanations of types of robes and the meaning of *nyohō e* on their commercial websites where temple priests order their robes.[6] *Nyohō e* is thus a complex term in Japan that has been shaped by textual, oral and commercial authorities, while at the same time denoting the form of the robe that is closest to the Indian *vinaya* prescriptions.

For all their variety, each of these contemporary Japanese groups relies directly or indirectly on the *vinaya*, a body of Buddhist literature that explains the rules of monastic life, citing the precedents and context of each rule. These large collections of monastic codes address details of practical life that portray the state of the Buddhist order at the time of the writing, centuries after the Buddha's lifetime.[7] Each rule is presented as a response to a situation encountered by the Buddha and his disciples during his long life as a teacher. Before the Tokugawa period, studies of the *kesa* in Japan relied primarily on

writings from the so-called "Southern school" of *vinaya* initiated by the Chinese *vinaya* Master, Daoxuan. The majority of Daoxuan's teaching on the *kesa* is contained in his three major commentaries on the Four Part Vinaya: *Four Part Vinaya Practice and Service Comments* (*Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔, T 40. no. 1804; hereafter *Practice and Service Comments*); *Four Part Vinaya Annotated Precepts Handbook* (*Sifen lu biqiu hanzhu jieben* 四分律比丘含注戒本, T 40. no. 1806); and *Four Part Vinaya Supplementary Procedures* (*Sifen lu shan suichi jiema* 四分律刪補隨機羯磨, T 40. no. 1808). In these three commentaries Daoxuan does not restrict himself to the *Four Part Vinaya,* supplementing his remarks on the robe with citations from other *vinaya* compilations. Daoxuan also authored two independent works: *Vinaya Characteristics Revelations* (*Lüxiang gantong zhuan* 律相感通伝, T 45. no. 1898, hereafter *Vinaya Revelations*); and *Chapter on Buddhist Vestments* (*Shimen zhang fuyi* 釋門章服儀, T 45. no. 1894; hereafter, *Buddhist Vestments*) in which he describes teachings he received from visions granted to him by the gods. These two works contain some of Daoxuan's most controversial teachings about the robe that were later criticized for their visionary source. Daoxuan's interpretation of the *vinaya* was transmitted to Japan in the eighth century by Jianzhen 鑑真 (688-763; hereafter Ganjin).[8]

Japanese Buddhists also studied the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* (*Genben shuoyiqie youbu pinaiye* 根本説一切有部毘奈耶, T 23 no. 1442-1445), translated by Yijing 義浄 (635-713). Yijing, having traveled to India himself, was critical of Daoxuan's explanation of certain key points in regard to the robe. Yijing's translation was brought into Japan in 806 by Kūkai 空海 (774-835), the Buddhist leader regarded as the founder of the Japanese Shingon school, but it was little studied until the Tokugawa period (Clarke 2006, 3). Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718-1804), who established his own school of *vinaya* practice called the *True Dharma vinaya* (*Shōbōritsu* 正法律), is noted for his synthesis of these two important *vinaya*. Jiun's teaching of the *kesa*, preserved in his

writings and by a lineage of nuns trained in his style of *kesa* sewing, greatly influenced Sawaki's understanding of the *kesa.* During the Tokugawa period, as *vinaya* studies expanded in Japan, points of contention over the form of the robe were debated using a wide variety of *vinaya* texts and commentaries.

The form of Buddhist robes promoted by modern *kesa* sewing practitioners is based on this synthesis of different *vinaya*, and contemporary students of the *kesa* in Japan have a considerable range of materials to draw on, some of it contradictory. There are also a number of modern Japanese studies of the Buddhist robe as portrayed in the *vinaya* literature. Satō Mitsuō 佐藤密雄 (1963), former Dean of the faculty of Buddhism at Taishō University, has written the most readable and thorough comparison of the various *vinaya*. Abe Jion 阿部慈園 (1985, 2001), a professor at Meiji University who wrote numerous introductory books about Buddhist thought and practice, discusses the robe as an ascetic practice in early Buddhism and in Dōgen's fascicles. Nasu Seiryō 那須政隆, a Shingon scholar and professor at Taisho University, wrote a study in 1961 of the *vinaya* teachings on the *kesa,* including explanations of modern Japanese practices. Similarly, Horiuchi Kanjin 堀内寛仁, a Shingon scholar at Mt. Kōya, wrote about the various historical and contemporary garments of the Shingon school in his 1983 study, discussing Jiun Onkō's work on the form and the role of *nyohō e* in the context of other forms used in the Shingon school. Although all these works purport to explain the robe practice described in the *vinaya,* the different forms of what they identify as *nyohō e* demonstrates the fluidity of the concept of being "in accord with the *dharma*" and the term *nyohō e* is clearly appropriated by different groups for different purposes. Significantly, the two works by Shingon scholars show how the *nyohō e* is harmoniously incorporated in Shingon as one of many types of clerical vestments without threatening the status quo.

Clothing rules and the language used to describe the essentials of color, fabric and measure are sensitive to time, place, climate, and social conditions so it can be quite challenging to understand exactly what is meant by a rule. When Buddhist culture traveled from India to China, adaptations of these garments to a different climate and culture were naturally vulnerable to being labelled as not complying with the *vinaya*. The yearning to return to the type of robe that the Buddha wore and the firm conviction that the texts of early Buddhism would reveal this robe, obscures the fact that in some cases even the *vinaya* texts are describing social and physical circumstances that had changed since the Buddha's lifetime. During the five hundred years after the Buddha's death as the *vinaya* was being compiled, his followers were already dealing with the first fundamental adaptation of the robe that was propelled by a shift away from wandering asceticism to a settled monastic life. These competing visions of the meaning of the Buddhist robe guarantee that no single, exclusive form of the robe defines *nyohō e*. The following discussion is not intended to be an accurate description of the kinds of robes that Indian Buddhists wore based on the *vinaya*. Rather, it is an interpretation of key themes and issues that are essential for understanding the Japanese interpretation of the Buddhist robe in accord with the *dharma*.

Part 2. Three Paradigms of the Buddhist Robe

Vinaya prescriptions for the robe testify to the tension between ascetic and monastic practices and demonstrate how Buddhists negotiated changes in the robe, the most public and material expression of the Buddhist teaching. The origin of both the ascetic and monastic prescriptions concerning dress are ascribed to the Buddha. Thus, a "robe according to the teaching" in its most basic sense is not one particular physical form but is the expression of a Buddhist ethos of clothing. Two stories about the origin of the rag robe and the monastic robe demonstrate this ethos. The story of the genesis of the rag

robe is concerned with the question, "What is the minimum physical requirement to sustain practice?" The story of the monastic robe, in contrast, addresses the question, "What is the relationship between the Buddhist monk and the wider society?"

The rag robe (Sanskrit, *pāṃsukūla* ; Japanese, *funzōe* 糞掃衣) is included in the list of authorized ascetic practices (*dhūta*) for followers of the Buddha who made rough garments from cloth discarded at gravesites and roadsides.[9] The cloth was no longer usable because it was considered to be polluted either by association with death and bodily processes or by having been used in rituals. The *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya* (*Mohe sengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, T 22, no 1425) states that Buddha's followers picked up this cloth, washed, dyed and stitched them together into robes which they wore as part of their ascetic practice (fasc. 16; T 22.357a).[10] From the point of view of the *vinaya,* a robe made following these precise prescriptions (gathering, washing, dyeing and stitching together) was deemed *nyohō e* by conforming to the rule for rag robes and was therefore "pure." Here, purity refers not to whether the cloth was clean, but whether it had undergone the prescribed procedure.[11]

The practice of wearing the rag robe is also idealized in *vinaya* literature as one of the four supports of practice (*niśraya*): wearing rag robes, taking frugal meals, residing under a tree, and using only medications made from fermented urine (Prebish 1974, 4).[12] These four supports, which seem to indicate a rather severe physical practice, were central to the ordination ceremony. Having acknowledged these four supports, however, the ordinee is then advised about the allowable exceptions to this simple lifestyle, a measure of both the reverence and the ambivalence with which these practices were regarded (Schopen 2004, 26, 91-92).[13] As one of the twelve (or thirteen) ascetic

practices (*dhūtaguṇa*) that defined the lives of forest dwellers (*āraṇyaka*), the rag robe becomes a kind of field mark for those who follow the ascetic rather than the monastic path. Passages that express ambivalence toward these practitioners typically mention the practice of the rag robe (Schopen 2004, 26).

Although the *vinaya*, a product of settled monastic communities, sometimes expresses real aversion toward the forest dwellers themselves, the ascetic ideal itself was revered. For example, Mahākāśyapa, foremost in ascetic practices among the Buddha's disciples, was portrayed in early Buddhist texts as wearing a rag robe. He is depicted as tearing up his worldly garments to resew them into rough robes, and as being singled out by the Buddha as the only one worthy of exchanging robes to wear the rag robe of the Buddha (Silk 2003). The iconic power of the rag robe is illustrated by depictions of Buddha and his disciples in Chinese paintings and sculptures, and became a standard aspect of the iconography of the founders of Japanese teaching lineages. If we examine these East Asian depictions of rag robes, however, they appear to represent a practice that is quite different from that described in the *vinaya* as the ascetic practice of the rag robe.

Monier-Williams (1899, 613.3) lists the word *pāṃśukūla* under the root "*pāṃsu,*" which he defines as: (1) a dust-heap; (2) a collection of rags out of a dust-heap used by Buddhist monks for their clothing and one who wears robes made of rags (*pāṃśukūla*; *pāṃśukūlika*); (3) crumbling soil, dust, sand; (4) dung or manure (a lexical definition, rarely used in speech); (5) menses. A typical *vinaya* list of the ten kinds of fabric suitable for making the rag robe reflects these meanings for *pāṃsu.* The rag robe is made from cloth that has been:

> 1. chewed by cows; 2. chewed by rodents; 3. burnt; 4. used for menstruation; 5. used in childbirth; 6. used for ceremonies in a shrine, then naturally carried away from the shrine by birds, animals or the wind; 7. used in burial ceremonies; 8. used

for petitionary rites to the gods; 9. discarded when receiving employment from the king [e.g., discarding the old uniform on a promotion]; 10. (used to wrap a corpse) and brought back (from the charnel ground). These are said to be the ten types of rag robe.

糞掃衣有十種。牛嚼衣。鼠噛衣。燒衣。月水衣。産婦衣。神廟中衣。若鳥銜風吹離處者塚間衣。求願衣。受王職衣。往還衣。是謂十種糞掃衣。

(fasc. 39, T 22.850a).

As this list shows, the *vinaya* defines a wider range of cloth suitable for rag robes than indicated by the word *pāṃsu.* The list includes several items used for ceremonial purposes (numbers six, eight, and nine) that are unsuitable for ordinary use after having been used in rituals. Note, however, that the cloth used for rites to the gods, or discarded after succession or promotion rituals were quite likely of very fine quality. Their inclusion in this list suggests that at least by the time of the writing of the *vinaya*, fine luxury fabrics were not excluded from the practice of wearing a rag robe. This loophole takes on greater significance in the robe practices developed in the geographical areas of present day China, Korea and Japan.

In translating the *vinaya,* the Chinese used characters that evoked the sound of the Sanskrit word, *pāṃsu,* while giving some sense of its meaning: 糞掃 (Chinese, *fensao*; Japanese, *funzō*) literally, "shit wiping [cloth]." But as noted above, the fourth definition of *pāṃsu* as "manure" is the least commonly used. The transliteration thus obscures the wider semantic range of the word *pāṃsu.* It has considerable shock value for East Asian Buddhists, who wonder what kind of clothing is made from shit wiping rags. I cannot do justice to this complex issue here, but even this brief explanation shows the potential for confusion when the narrow, literal meaning of the Chinese glyphs are taken as definitive, and the more inclusive and subtle distinctions of the list of ten types of *pāṃsu* fabric are

ignored.

The second paradigm is the monastic robe.[14] The *Ten Recitations vinaya* (*Shisong lü* 十誦律律, T 23. no. 1435) explains the origin of the monastic Buddhist robe as a response to a request from King Bimbisāra for the Buddha's disciples to wear distinctive clothing. The story has two parts; first, King Bimbisāra's mistaken identification of a travelling ascetic as one of the Buddha's disciples; and second, the Buddha's inspiration for the design of the robe and his directions to Ānanda (fasc. 27; T 23.194c-195a).[15] The first part of the story relates how King Bimbisāra, thinking that he saw the Buddha's disciple from afar, dismounted from his elephant and began his obeisance, only to discover his mistake as the wanderer approached. Bimbisāra asks the Buddha for a distinctive mode of dress so that lay believers can easily identify his disciples from a distance. Sometime after this incident, the Buddha admired the pattern made by the ripening fields, and charged his disciple, Ānanda, with the task of making a robe that reflected the pattern of field and furrow. Ānanda then cut fabric into pieces and sewed these pieces into panels with seams on each side representing the furrows between the fertile portions of the field, referred to in Japanese as the *densō* 田相 portion of the panel. The Buddha praised Ānanda's design, saying "this cut and sewn robe is made in accord with the teaching."

According to this story, the creation of a distinctive style of clothing was initiated by the needs of lay supporters. The Buddha suggested a general model for the design, but it is the disciple whose task it is to implement these vague indications, creating the actual dimensions and design of a garment and submitting it to the Buddha for approval. The result is a robe that functions as a flag or banner for the order. The original impetus, design and implementation of a distinctive robe was a cooperative project involving lay supporter, Buddha and the disciples. The story also contains two key metaphors: the

implied metaphor of the robe as a flag, and the explicit metaphor of the robe as a fertile field.

The fertile field is one of the most important metaphors in Buddhism, often used as an analogy in which donations given to the worthy monk will produce spiritual nourishment for the donor just as planting and tending the fields produces physical nourishment. According to the *Sāṁyuktāgama* (*Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經 fasc. 35; T 2.254c), the monk is thus a field of merit. Extending the metaphor into an analogy between the field design of the robe and the monk as a field of merit is not found in *vinaya* literature but it is developed in East Asian Buddhism. The extended metaphor appears in *Śākya's Essential Readings* (*Shizhi yaolan* 釋氏要覽, fasc. 1; T 54.269a), a compilation of key passages from Buddhist texts with comments by Daocheng 道誠 (fl. 1019).[16] The origin story of the Buddhist monastic robe validates the interdependence of monks and lay supporters, providing the authority for what some have called one of the most ancient and enduring rituals of the Buddhist faith still practiced in Southeast Asian Buddhism: the ritual donation of cloth (*kaṭhina*) that occurs annually after the rainy season retreat (Holt 1995, 134-136).[17]

These two origin stories provide narrative frames for the simple lists of approved fabrics for rag robes or monastic robes that seem to indicate different approaches to the Buddha's teaching: one that views Buddhism as a religion of ascetic seekers apart from society, and the other that sees Buddhism as a monastic practice in symbiotic relationship with the laity. It appears that for modern Japanese practitioners the question of which is more antique and by corollary, more authentic, is secondary to the fact that *vinaya* literature and commentaries depict both patterns as initiated by the Buddha. In robe sewing groups both types of origin stories are revered and used in different contexts to promote faith and respect for the Buddhist robe.

There is, however, a third paradigm of the robe seen in early Buddhist literature: the case of the golden robe woven for the Buddha by his aunt and foster mother, Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī, which appears in the *Scripture of the Wise and Foolish* (*Damamūka*; *Xianyu jing* 賢愚経, fasc.12; T 4.434a). In contrast to the rag robe and monastic traditions of a modest or even poor appearance, the story of a robe of golden thread is a conundrum for practitioners. It gives rise to questions about the role of the Buddha: "What rules bind the Buddha? Does the Buddha wear special garments suitable to his attainment?" and, "What gifts are appropriate to the Buddha?" Ambiguities and contradictions between different versions of the story of the golden robe provided considerable scope for interpretation. Tomomatsu (1965, 2.19-35) offers a thorough analysis of variations of the story. The paradigm is particularly influential in China and Japan where the golden robe of the Buddha became a symbol of the lineage of transmission of the teaching from master to disciple. To some degree it is responsible for the widespread practice of wearing gold brocade robes (*kinran e* 金欄衣) in modern Japanese Buddhism.[18]

The critical point is whether the Buddha accepts this garment and what becomes of it. In some versions the Buddha refuses to accept the golden robe, asking his aunt to give it to the order of monks. He rejects it because a gift of love is inappropriate for one who has renounced worldly ties. But the issue of the gift of the golden robe is also about the distribution of goods, namely, which gifts should be for the Buddha, and which for the order of monks (Tomomatsu 1965, 2.19). When the monks in turn refuse to accept the golden robe it is decided that the garment should be kept in trust for Maitreya, the future Buddha.

Xuanzang's seventh century record of his travels to the west and to India, *Record of Western Lands in the Great Tang* (*Da Tang xiyu zhi* 大唐西域記, T 51. no. 2087), was

one of the most influential interpretations of this story for East Asian Buddhism. Xuanzang recounts a story about the golden robe: when the Buddha's life drew to a close, he bestowed a golden thread *kesa* on his disciple Mahākāśyapa as a recognition of his disciple's understanding. The robe was to be kept in trust for the arrival of Maitreya (fasc. 9; T 51.902a). This version is repeated in the Chan text, *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* (*Jing de zhuan deng lu* 景徳傳燈録 fasc. 1; T 51.364b). In this account, the ancient story of the *kesa* woven with golden threads to be held in trust for Maitreya became fused with the Chan school's account of their lineage, reinterpreting the golden robe as the mark of transmission in their lineage of living teachers. Not all were convinced, however, and the question of whether the Buddha's gift of a robe to Mahākāśyapa was a golden robe or his own rag robe was disputed during the Tokugawa period when the more widespread use of gold brocade robes was criticized by reformers.[19]

These are the three major patterns of belief and practice regarding the Buddhist robe: the ascetic's rag robes, the monastic robe made of donated materials, and finally the Buddha's golden robe. Practically speaking the three paradigms are not mutually exclusive and there is considerable borrowing between them. There is, however, a potential for conflict between the ideals represented by the rag robe and the monastic robe, since both claim an origin with the Buddha but operate in very different circumstances.

Two Buddhist teachings about the robe bridge differences between the paradigms of rag robe and monastic robe that I have described above. First, the attitude toward the Buddhist robe conveyed by the three humilities, *sansen* 三賤 (discussed below), can be identified in the physical prescriptions for both the rag robe and the monastic robe. Although their physical expression is necessarily different, based on the different origins

of the cloth from which they are made, the attitude of the humilities is still conveyed by their forms. Second, as I discuss in this chapter and in subsequent chapters, ambiguities between the terms "rag robe" and "pieced robe" provided a middle ground between the paradigms of rag robes and monastic robes that was developed in new ways by East Asian Buddhists.

The ethos of the Buddhist robe promotes an understanding of "few wants, knowing sufficiency," *shōyoku chisoku* 小欲知足.[20] The *Shian jian lü pi po sha* (善見律毘婆沙, T 24. no. 1462), a commentary on the *vinaya* that is regarded as closest to the Pali *vinaya*, explains that the robes are garments that neither distract the monk from his practice nor cause envy in the laity (fasc. 7; T 24.717c). The *vinaya* explains the three humilities of the knife, *tōsen* 刀賤, of color, *shikisen* 色賤, and of garments, *esen* 衣賤 that convey this ethos (fasc. 58; T 22.998c). The humility of the knife requires donated cloth to be cut into small pieces before being made into robes. This destroys the worldly value of the cloth, making it unsuitable for the laity or for commercial purposes. The humility of color requires that the cloth be dyed, producing an indeterminate or, more literally, "broken" color, *ejiki* 壞色. The five primary colors, *shōshiki* 正色, of red, yellow, blue, white or black must particularly be avoided. The humility of garments requires the surface of the cloth to be stitched throughout, literally, pierced, *sasu* 刺す, destroying its softness and flexibility, and making the surface rough (fasc. 7; T 24.717c).

The aim of the three humilities is to destroy the attractive qualities of length, color and softness of the donated cloth. The result is that although they may be made of new cloth, the monastic robes will more closely resemble the rag robe, composed of pieces of cloth in a uniform but indeterminate color that are sewn together into rough robes. The three humilities indicate criteria for *nyohō e* that apply equally to rag robes or to monastic robes. This provides a definition that diminishes the contrast between the ascetic and the

monastic types of robe.

Next, the overlapping semantic relationship between the term *nōe/nōgesa* 衲衣／衲袈裟, "pieced robe" and *funzōe* 糞掃衣 "rag robe" in Chinese and Japanese usage provides room for interpretation and experimentation with the form of the robe. The term "pieced robe," *nōe,* was used to translate the Sanskrit word, *kanthā,* a word that refers to garments made from scraps of cloth.[21] It is a broad term encompassing both the monastic robe made from new, donated cloth that has been cut and sewn, and robes sewn together from used cloth. The absence of specific rules about the origin of the cloth, however, suggests that these were monastic robes, not rag robes, and that the term was applied to any garment made of pieces of cloth. As discussed earlier, the term *pāṃsukūla*, derived from the word *pāṃsu,* refers to one of the ascetic practices and is limited to specific types of used cloth. The Sanskrit terms *kanthā* and *pāṃsukūla* appear to refer to different kinds of garments, *kanthā* indicating a general category of garments pieced from scraps, and *pāṃsukūla* indicating garments used specifically for ascetic practice.

A clear distinction between these two terms has not always been maintained in Chinese and Japanese sources. Some sources treat *nōe* and *funzōe* as synonyms, but others argue that as these two terms derive from different Sanskrit terms, they must be kept distinct. Unfortunately the issue cannot be easily resolved because both sides claim sources in *vinaya* and scriptural sources as well as Sanskrit-Chinese dictionaries ("nōe" in BD 5.4165) . The *Mahāsāṅghika vinaya* lists sixteen varieties of robes, a number of them categorized by the type of cloth used. The last three types listed are the *nōe*, the *kojie* 居士衣 (householder's robe), and the *funzōe*, clearly differentiating *nōe* and *funzōe* (fasc. 8; T 22.292b). Interestingly, the inclusion of the householder's robe suggests that these last three types of robes referred to different groups of people, namely, the robes of monastics

(*nōe*), householders (*kojie*), and ascetics (*funzōe*). Whenever *nōe* and *funzōe* are treated as synonyms, their identification with distinct groups of Buddhist practitioners is lost.

There is further evidence in the *vinaya* to support the view of the pieced robe as a general category of garments made from scraps, of which one type is the rag robe. One illustration of the wider scope of the pieced robe is the case of the five-pieced robe, *gonōe* 五衲衣, a robe pieced together of scraps of as many as five different colors. I will call this the multi-color pieced robe. In the *vinaya* account of this type of robe, Śāriputra is granted permission to make a robe out of donated scraps of cloth in bright, clear colors (fasc. 41; T 22.864a). As discussed above, the rules for the rag robe state that discarded cloth gathered by the practitioner must first be washed, then dyed before being sewn into a robe, and that bright pure colors must be avoided. The rule, however, makes no mention of dyeing the cloth, nor does it refer to broken color, implying that permission was granted to use the cloth as is. This rule appears to justify the use of robes made of brightly colored bits of cloth.

The Chinese depicted multi-color pieced robes in paintings and sculptures. For example, paintings of Mahākāśyapa, revered as the foremost disciple in ascetic practices and therefore likely to be depicted in rag robes, is shown wearing robes with patches of distinct colors of green, brown, purple, reddish brown and other colors, and in some cases, lines of vertical white or dark lines indicating the running stitches on the surface of the cloth. This style of depicting robes also appears in paintings of Śākyamuni and Kṣitigarbha, (Jizō 地藏), who is typically shown in the garb of a monk (Zhang 2000: 43, 96, 132). These artistic depictions of the multi-color pieced robes were adopted in Japan and are prevalent in medieval Japanese portraits of famous monks.

Seventh and eighth century *kesa* traditionally referred to as *nōgesa* are extant in Japan. These *kesa*, which show distinct variations in the colors of the patches, were

preserved as temple treasures in the Shōsōin 正倉院 storehouse of Tōdaiji 東大寺 in Nara and at Hōryūji 法隆寺, both located in Nara prefecture. Naming conventions for these textiles suggests that in the eighth century the Japanese preserved the distinction between rag robes and pieced robes, undoubtedly learned from continental informants. The *kesa* in the Shōsōin and Hōryūji collections and other *kesa* of this type brought from China are invariably referred to as *nōe* or *nōgesa* in ancient and medieval Japanese documents. The term *funzōe*, however, is not used in connection with these *kesa* until the late eighteenth century. These paintings, statues and *kesa* textiles testify to the impact of the multi-color pieced robe on the mental conception of the Buddhist robe in East Asia. I will discuss these artifacts and artistic representations in more detail in the next chapter.

The broader application and use of the term pieced robe is also seen in the metonymic use of the character *nō* 衲 (pieced) in East Asian Buddhism. It is used in writing as a humble convention to refer to oneself or in combination with other characters to create a general category indicating monks (i.e. those who wear the pieced robe). In contrast, the term for rag robes, *funzōe*, did not produce such linguistic offshoots.

As I have described it, the two paradigms of the rag robe and the monastic robe in Buddhist literature arose from two quite different explanations of the origin of the robe. In spite of these differences, however, there is considerable room for borrowing and overlap in meaning. The teaching of the three humilities of cutting, dyeing and stitching, for example, brings the monastic robe closer to the form of rag robes. The ambiguities between the terms for rag robe and pieced robe leave considerable leeway for experimentation with the form that was certainly used by East Asian Buddhists in their production and depiction of Buddhist robes. The next section outlines the main characteristics of the monastic robe that were scrutinized so intensely by Tokugawa period scholar-monks who sought to reform Japanese Buddhist robe practices. The

following discussion provides an overview of issues about the construction of the monastic robe that will be discussed in greater depth in subsequent chapters.

Part 3. Characteristics of the Monastic Robe

Buddhist literature describes the minimum six possessions allowed to the monk which includes three robes, a mat or *zagu* 坐具, a bowl and a strainer to remove insects from water. Lists of the personal possessions allowed to monks vary from a minimum of six objects of clothing and personal hygiene up to a maximum of eighteen items, including ritual implements for worship, listed in the *Fanwang jing* 梵網經 (fasc. 10; T 24.1008a).

Nakamura Hajime (1969, 320; also Abe 1985, 164) argues on the basis of Jain records that only one of the three robes, the great robe or *saṅghāṭī* probably made of pieced scraps, was used by ancient Indian Buddhist groups. This hypothesis supports the legendary status of the rag robe as the garment that the Buddha wore, with the set of three robes as a custom that developed in settled monastic groups. It is not my purpose here to establish what the Buddha actually wore, but to consider different kinds of garments that are said to be Buddhist robes. By raising the question of a single robe that carried the essence of Buddhist vestments Nakamura's hypothesis puts the East Asian practice of wearing a single *kesa* over other garments in a very different light. From this perspective, the only important robe is the "great robe" and all other robes are, in a sense, undergarments.

Nevertheless, the three robes, often referred to by the collective Sanskrit name, *tricīvara* (*san'ne* 三衣) are invariably included in discussions of Buddhist robes, and through constant repetition in *vinaya* and commentary have achieved a kind of legendary status of their own. In 1211 Shunjō 俊芿 1166-1227), who had studied in China for twelve years, imported a number of *vinaya* texts to Japan with the intention of reforming

monastic practice and establishing a center for the study of Tendai, Ritsu, Zen, Jōdo and Mikkyō teachings at Sennyūji 泉涌寺 in Kyoto. Among the many *vinaya* texts that Shunjō imported was the *Guide to Six Possessions of Buddhist monks* (*Fozhi biqui liuwu tu* 佛制比丘六物圖, T 45. no.. 1900, henceforth *Guide to Six Possessions*), a commentary by Yuanzhao (元照 1048-1116), a priest in Daoxuan's lineage. The *Guide to Six Possessions*, a short and readable manual, inspired Japanese commentaries during the medieval period that kept *kesa* studies alive and provided a basis on which Tokugawa reforms could grow. In Sōtō Zen, the six necessities were discussed in secret teachings recorded on transmission documents known as *kirikami* 切り紙 (Ishikawa 2001, 311-336; Faure 1995).

Explications of the set of three robes provide the name of the robe, the number of panels and how and when each robe is worn. The first of three robes is made of five panels, *andae* 安陀衣, and is worn next to the skin around the lower half of the body from navel to knees. This robe is sometimes referred to as the inner robe, to be worn inside the temple when one is working about the compound. The second is the robe of seven panels, *uttarasō* 欝多羅僧, worn over the left shoulder and covering part of the upper body but leaving the right arm and shoulder free. This robe, sometimes called the upper robe or the assembly robe, is to be worn when performing rituals or eating with other monks. Finally the great robe, *sōgyari* 僧伽梨, is made of nine to twenty five panels and is worn on the upper body.[22] It is also called the double robe because it is lined with a second layer of cloth. It is to be used for occasions on which there will be contact with the laity. This garment may be worn over both shoulders, *tsūken* 通肩, when one is engaged in activities outside the monastery.[23]

According to this description, the three robes form a complete outfit whose parts are used according to the circumstances. Rectangular in shape, each of the three robes

are wrapped around the body similar to the way in which sari are worn, so the shape of the garments did not differ radically from native Indian dress. When introduced to China, however, this style of dress was not well received. The bared right shoulder was particularly offensive to the Chinese who preferred to cover the body. This point is discussed in the early sixth century compilation of criticisms and apologetica of Buddhism, the *Propagation of the Light* (*Hongming ji* 弘明集; fasc. 5; T 52.32b).

Rather than wearing the full outfit of three robes, the Chinese wore one of the three rectangular garments wrapped around the body over ordinary clothing, an adaptation that had profound consequences for the meaning of the Buddhist robe in East Asian cultures. Gradually, a set of specialized garments to be worn under the Indian robes developed in China, and these variations were successively adopted and preserved by the Japanese. Opinions vary as to whether these garments are to be classified as religious vestments. Since my research is focused mainly on the *kesa*, I will discuss these garments only as needed. The significance of the Chinese adaptation is that by abandoning the functional harmony of the three robes in Indian Buddhist dress, it unmoors the *kesa*, pushing it closer to the kind of vestigial status of an ancient garment whose function is no longer understood, but whose history evokes reverence. The disjunction between the East Asian adaptation of the Buddhist outfit and the textual prescriptions of their function and meaning meant that the set of three robes as the basic requirement of the ordained monk is more a matter of faith and religious study than a practical necessity.

Most commentaries divide the physical prescriptions for these three robes into three categories: one, the kinds of fabrics suitable for robes, *tai* 体; two, colors and dye names, *shiki* 色; and three, size and types of robes as well as construction methods, *ryō* 量. The following sections discuss the *vinaya* prescriptions for these three aspects,

including cases in which Chinese commentaries, influential in Japan, diverge somewhat from the prescriptions.

Material

Direct donation of the material for robes was an important part of the interaction between Buddhist communities and lay followers. Satō Mitsuo (1963, 669-671) argues that the practice of offering cloth directly to the monks arose from a long established practice of leaving used cloth outside for rag robe wearing monks to find and use, a form of indirect or anonymous donation. One case that he cites tells of a lay person seeing the son of a high class local family who had left home to become a Buddhist monk picking through the garbage to find cloth to make robes. In pity the layman left cloth out on the road where the young man would find it (fasc. 39, T 22. 849b). In contrast, the rules for direct lay donation refer only to the types of fiber used in making the cloth, namely, three kinds of linen, two kinds of silk, two kinds of wool, cotton, feathers and fabric made from wood. In at least two passages in the *Four Part Vinaya* where these fabrics are formally listed as a group of ten, a reference to the ascetic's rag robe immediately precedes the list (fasc. 6; T 22. 602a; fasc. 39 849b).[24] Despite some variation between the *vinaya*, silk is always included in the list of appropriate fabrics for lay donation.

Daoxuan, however, wrote in his commentary, *Practice and Service Comments,* that silk was not allowed for any robe. His argument was based on his interpretation of the term *gagu* 臥具 (literally, "reclining gear"; i.e., sleeping mat) as a categorical term for the set of three robes (fasc. 2; T 40. 69a).[25] Since silk was prohibited for the *gagu*, Daoxuan argued that the intention of the *vinaya* was to prohibit the use of silk in all robes. Daoxuan also cites the *Sarvastivada vinaya* "four meanings," *shigi* 四義, of stopping slander, extending faith and respect, practicing the way in order to attain peace,

and doing no harm to living beings, emphasizing this last point to argue that the Buddha's robe as a "robe of compassion" should not be made from materials that harm others (fasc. 2; T 40. 68c).[26] Daoxuan and his followers extended the prohibition against silk to include other objects besides robes. In *Chapter on Buddhist Vestments* Daoxuan argued that donated silk materials must be refused or destroyed (T 45. 836a). Suwa (1984, 165) speculates that the Chinese were more sensitive to the suffering of the silkworms than the Indians because of their greater contact with the manufacturing process. He cites the influence of arguments against meat-eating that appear in the *Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra,* suggesting that Chinese Buddhists were already questioning the use of silk more than a century before Daoxuan formulated his arguments prohibiting its use in robes.[27]

Yijing, in his account of his travels to India and Southeast Asia, *Record of the Inner Dharma from the Southern Seas* (*Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸内法傳, T 54. no. 2125), criticized Daoxuan's position on silk in robes as a misunderstanding of the meaning of the word *gagu* and a needless complication for monks, forcing them to find alternatives for the readily available silk. Furthermore, he argued, the prohibition even against donated materials contradicts one of the basic tenets of the Buddhist tradition, that a monk may receive donations whose production initially involved killing, so long as he personally did not initiate the act (fasc. 2; T 54.212c-213a). In fairness to Daoxuan, however, since a protocol was established in *vinaya* texts for using the set of three robes for sitting and sleeping, the confusion between "three robes" and "sitting mat" is understandable, an argument that Yuanzhao makes in defense of Daoxuan in his *Guide to Six Possessions* (T 45.898a). Daoxuan's position on silk became a more public issue in Japan during the Tokugawa period when more scholar-monks began to study Daoxuan's works and put his ideas into practice.

Color

The Sanskrit term that East Asians commonly use to refer to the three robes is *kaṣāya*, or, in Japanese, *kesa* 袈裟. In Japanese, *kesa* is used to refer to all three of the robes, similar to the usage of the Sanskrit term, *tricivara*, or "three robes" (*san'ne* 三衣). The term *kaṣāya,* however, indicated a color used for dyeing Buddhist robes. The very fact that they were a dyed color distinguished monks' robes from the white robes of householders, so the dyed robe, *sen'e* 染衣, indicated monastic robes, while the white-robed, *byakue* 白衣, indicated laity. If the robe was insufficiently dyed, then it was deemed an infraction for resembling the white robes of the laity (fasc. 16; T 22. 676c). Monastic robes were not, however, restricted to one color, rather, the various colors allowed by the *vinaya* may have distinguished Buddhist groups from one another (Mochizuki 1937, 112-117).

As I discussed above, the *vinaya* stipulates that the robe must not be one of five primary colors, *jōshiki* 上色, of blue, yellow, red, white or black.[28] The "robe according to the dharma" is defined by its broken color, *ejiki* 壊色, usually achieved by mixing several colors to dye the cloth. The resulting indeterminate color conveys the value of the "humility of color." The color should identify the wearer as a Buddhist monk but it should be subdued and vague, hard to pin down. In the *vinaya*, the indeterminate color of the monks' robes belongs to one of three families of colors: blue-brown (literally, copper), muddy black/grey, and dark red, which includes a range from brownish red, 木蘭 *mokuran*, to yellowish red, *kenda* 乾陀 (fasc. 16; T 22.676c).

In China and Japan, the word for "black" (*kuro* 黒) was rarely used in compounds referring to robes. Instead, a special term meaning purplish black (*shi* 緇) indicated the dark robes of the Buddhist monk, and, by extension, to monks themselves. For example, Zanning 賛寧 (919-1001) of the Southern mountain *vinaya* school associated with Daoxuan, used the term in his *Great Song Compendium of Monastic History* (*Da Song*

Seng shi lü e 大宋僧史略, fasc. 1; T 54.238a). In Japanese, the character signifies monastics in compounds such as *shiryū* 緇流, *shimon* 緇門, and *shito* 緇徒.[29] The color term for laity, namely plain or white, *so* 素 or *haku* 白, was combined with shi 緇 to form a compound term meaning monks and laity, literally, black and white: *shiso* 緇素, or *shihaku* 緇白. The compound *shiso* appears in early ninth century Japanese Buddhist writings, evidence that this use of the color terms for white and black were generally understood to refer to laity and monks.[30] A far more complex situation developed over the use of color in Buddhist robes. During the seventh century the government of the Tang Emperor, Taizong 太宗 (598-649), established a system that coordinated rank with the color of courtier's robes. By 629 fifteen degrees of rank in descending order were identified by the following colors: four ranks of purple, six ranks of vermilion, seven of green and eight of blue, a color code that was eventually applied to the garments of Buddhist priests who participated in official court events (Izutsu 1974, 56).

Western scholars have discussed the purple robe bestowed on worthy clerics, accepting the explanation in Zanning's account in *Great Song Compendium of Monastic History* that the custom began in 690 with Empress Wu who bestowed purple robes on nine Buddhist priests for their flattering interpretation of the *Great Cloud Scripture* (*Mahāmegha sūtra*; *Dayun wuxiang jing* 大雲無想經, T 12. no. 388) (Forte 2001, 147). Antonino Forte challenged this account, revising his own research to incorporate Yuanzhao's account of the origins of the purple robe in his commentary on Daoxuan's *Vinaya Practice and Service Comments.*[31] Yuanzhao indicates that the first occasion of a Buddhist priest wearing the purple robe was when Huaiyi 懷義 (d. 695) was invited to act as a counselor at court. Yuanzhao states that Huaiyi was permitted to wear his Buddhist *kesa* but its color had to conform to his rank as counselor at the court, rather than the "different" color of Buddhist robes. Forte's analysis of the evidence suggests that the use

of the purple *kesa* on this occasion, most likely in 686, was the result of tactful negotiations between the government and Huaiyi. From the view of the Tang government, it appears that the structure of the garment was of negligible importance but color, as an indication of rank, was a matter of serious consideration (Forte 2001, 157).[32] Yuanzhao explains that this initial precedent was reinforced four years later when Empress Wu awarded the same symbols of high rank to the nine priests who collaborated in the "false" compilation of the *Great Cloud Scripture,* commenting ruefully, "Once sprung from this evil beginning, [this malpractice] until now has not been reversed (Forte 2001, 149)." In a very short time the meaning of bestowing the purple robe had shifted away from court precedence toward a sign of imperial approval. This incident appears to be the origin of the practice of awarding *kesa* in purple and other bright colors to priests who had performed a service to the government (Izutsu 1974, 57).

Less than fifty years after Huaiyi received the purple robe, the practice had spread to Japan. Genbō 玄昉(? - 746), a Hossō priest who studied in China from 716 to 735, was given a purple robe by Emperor Xuanzong 玄宗. Returning to Japan, Genbō was appointed as head of Kōfukuji temple and subsequently awarded a purple robe by the hereditary ruler, Shōmu *tennō* 聖武天皇 (701-756).[33] The legal code of the early eighth century Japanese state was based on models in Tang China and the rules governing secular dress adopted the Chinese system of identifying rank by color of the garments. Izutsu (1974, 58) argues that this system influenced Buddhist vestments during the Nara and Heian periods. Although the purple *kesa* came to be thought of as a mark of the sovereign's favor in both China and Japan, the use of the color of the *kesa* as an indication of rank was not lost. Rather, the linking of color and rank is one of the most enduring characteristics of Japanese *kesa,* and is perhaps the one feature of *kesa* that is universally recognized by contemporary Japanese.[34]

A less well known example is the use of white in priest vestments in Japan. Technically, these are robes made of undyed, natural silk, *soken* 素絹. This practice, confined to the Tendai and Shingon schools, originated with Jie 慈慧 (912-985; also known as Gansan Daishi 元三大師), the 18th abbot of Enryakuji. Izutsu (1974, 123) cites *Notes on the Soken* (*Sokenki* 素絹記), written in 1571 by the Tendai priest, Jōchin 定珍 (1534-?) which states that Jie received a government directive to wear robes of unfigured, undyed silk in lieu of colored robes, that is, robes of the mixed color of *ejiki*. The blended, indeterminate color of the Buddhist robes was considered to be inappropriate for ceremonies conducted for the preservation of the nation, *chingo kokka* 鎮護國家 (Izutsu 1974, 123).[35] Initially this order addressed the color of the sleeved robe called the *henzan* 褊衫, but eventually white *kesa* were used as well.

Although the two examples of the purple robe initiated on the Chinese mainland and the white robes specific to the Japanese islands appear to be quite different their origins were reported in premodern accounts as a negotiation between a high ranking Buddhist priest and the government. As we saw in the case of Huaiyi, his closer physical relationship with the government as a counselor at court required him to abandon the indeterminate color of his Buddhist robes in favor of a color that corresponded to his court rank. By wearing this color, he would resemble other members of that rank. Similarly, in Japan, the use of the natural, undyed silk was thought to be more appropriate in situations where the Buddhist priest was performing state rituals with other ritual professionals of various lineages.[36] In both cases, the precedent set by the government involves only state occasions, and it is not an attempt to manipulate rules concerning the color of robes at the temple. Rather, the purpose is to provide uniformity at the state rituals. Although wearing these colors is a violation of the *vinaya* rules, these cases are depicted as affecting only priests who left the monastery to perform these duties and rites and were not intended to alter the monastic institution. These violations of the *vinaya*

were of little interest until the Kamakura period when the introduction of Yuanzhao's *Guide to Six Possessions* appears to have spurred criticism of the use of white robes.[37] At this point the first awareness of the "robe according to the dharma" begins to capture the imagination of a few reformers.

Measure

Measure, *ryō* 量, includes details about the size and construction of the robe as well as sewing methods. The monastic robe made from new cloth must be subjected to the "humility of the blade" by cutting cloth into small pieces that are then reassembled into equal sized panels. When these panels are sewn together lengthwise they form a rectangular robe large enough to wrap around the body. Rules defining the three robes prescribe the number of pieces per panel and the number of panels for each kind of robe. Time limits for making each of the three robes are defined in Japanese sources as: two days for a five panel robe, four days for a seven panel robe and five days for a great robe. These clear limits, however, do not appear in the *vinaya* nor in Daoxuan's commentaries, rather, they were prescribed by Yuanzhao and adopted by the Japanese as an authentic teaching of the *vinaya* (T 45.899b; Kawaguchi 1976, 337). The standard measurement is the length of the forearm from elbow to fist, *hiji* 肘, so, for example, the measurement of the great robe is said to be three by five arm lengths (*Mūlasarvāstivada vinaya,* fasc. 17; T 23. 716a).

The stitch used in the seams of the panels for a monk's robe, *kyakushi* 却刺, resembles the Western stitch called the backstitch. This method locks the thread into the layers of cloth by re-entering the cloth at a position slightly backward and downward from the point where the needle emerged at the completion of the previous stitch. This produces a loop that, when tightened, secures the stitches from being pulled out. The

backstitch, a requirement for properly made robes, differentiates monks' robes from lay robes, whose garments were sewn with a straight stitch (*Ten Recitations Vinaya,* fasc. 15; T 23.109b). Other details of construction include a border sewn onto the four sides of the robe to secure it from unraveling, and ties or fasteners that are affixed to the robe. In order to identify a garment made of new cloth as a Buddhist robe, a small stain or mark called the *tenjō* 點淨 is placed on the backside of the border, often near the corner. This mark completes the purification process that transforms new cloth into the Buddha's robe.[38]

The robe just described is made from new cloth that has been cut into pieces and resewn. This method of construction, which involves using overlapping horizontal and vertical seams, is called cut-and-sewn, *kassetsu* 割截. The robes must be constructed of an odd number of panels, from five up to twenty five panels (fasc. 40; T 22. 855b). For robes of seven to thirteen panels, each panel has two long and one short piece; in robes of fifteen to nineteen panels each panel is made of three long and one short piece; in robes of twenty-one to twenty five panels each panel is made of four long and one short piece, with the short piece in all cases always on one end. The individual panels are constructed so that the pieces at the top of the panel overlap each successive lower piece. These panels are then sewn together, alternating the position of the short piece to create a staggered pattern, not unlike brickwork. The cut-and-sewn method preserves the field pattern even in the way that the vertical and horizontal seams are sewn. The two vertical seams of the middle panel overlap the panels flanking either side, and each successive panel is overlapped from the panel closest to the center toward the outer edge of the robe. As discussed earlier in the metaphor of the robe as a field, the central portion of each piece corresponds to the planted portion of the field, and the seams correspond to irrigation ditches. Just as the water flows in the rice paddy, the teaching of the Buddha flows from the upper to the lower edge and from the center to the periphery of the robe,

nourishing the aspiration of the practitioner (Kawaguchi 1976, 140).

The *vinaya* makes exceptions for circumstances in which there is not enough donated cloth to make the cut and sewn type of robe. We have already seen one example in which Śāriputra requested to make a robe from small pieces of colored cloth. Another example is the "strip seam" method, *chōyō e* 帖葉衣 (fasc. 41; T 22.863a). The main body of the garment is constructed of one or several pieces of the same kind of cloth that have been sewn together with a simple running stitch. Strips of a different cloth are then sewn (appliqued) over this base to represent the pattern of seams of the cut-and-sewn type of *kesa*. The finished robe has a base of one color covered by a grid of contrasting strips. This method was commonly used in making multi-color pieced robes, and was later used in brocade robes because its lack of overlapping seams conserves expensive fabric. Japanese art often depicts founders and eminent monks wearing the multi-color pieced robe sewn with contrasting strip-seams. The sewing method can be identified in art by the contrast between the plain dark fabric shown in the vertical and horizontal strip-seams and the brighter multi-color fabric depicted in the field portion (*densō*) of each panel of the robe. Introduced to Japan during the eighth century, this kind of robe is also referred to as the tortoise shell pattern, *kōgesa* 甲袈裟, because the dark color of the strips highlights the colored field portion, just as the indentations of a tortoise shell contrasts with raised blocks of lighter color. Although the construction method is the same, the term *kōgesa* is mainly used for a *kesa* whose color combination is associated with a particular rank (Izutsu 1974, 78; Horiuchi 1983, 93-94).

The cut-and-sewn robe is particularly revered by Tokugawa period reformers because this method demonstrates the values embodied in the three humilities: cutting the cloth to destroy its secular value, dyeing it to a uniform, indeterminate color that does not attract envy or distract the monk from his practice, and stitching the robe so that the soft

surface of the cloth becomes rough. The design of its overlapping seams mimics the pattern of field and furrow through which water flows, reminding one of the metaphor of the monk as a fertile field.

Conclusion

As this overview shows, the rules for making Buddhist robes flexibly accommodate a variety of circumstances. These prescriptions, which are all "in accordance with the dharma," record and shape the behavior of monks and laity in regard to the material world and the surrounding culture. These texts are all that remain of Indian robes and it is easy to assume that they were the basis for robes in China and Japan. But the texts in fact played little or no role in the initial introduction of Buddhist robes to the Japanese islands. Living teachers and the artifacts and artistic representations that they brought with them introduced the Buddhist robe. Texts describing monastic rules about the robe lagged far behind, when Japanese culture had already adapted these garments to suit their own climactic, material and cultural conditions.

Although the Japanese had access to *vinaya* texts, there is little evidence of interest in the concept of *nyohō e* until the introduction of Yuanzhao's *Guide to Six Possessions* in the early Kamakura period, some six hundred years after the introduction of Buddhism. Its introduction marks a watershed in the Japanese awareness of the textual definition of the Buddhist robe. By that time detailed customs regarding the robe were already firmly established in Japanese culture. These customs included practices inherited from China, such as delineating rank through colored robes, and practices native to Japan, such as wearing white robes as a sign of purity. Thus, in spite of their ancient pedigree, textual definitions of the "robe according to the dharma" appeared as a kind of new teaching that had to compete with long established acculturated forms. Awareness that one's customary practice deviates from textual prescriptions may be a first step, but it takes a deep longing

for religious reform for people to consider changing their clothes. Although commentaries on this work nurtured a moderate interest in the regulations of the monastic robe through the medieval period, it was not until the seventeenth century that real enthusiasm and commitment to a reform of the monastic robe took hold. Before we tackle these reform movements, however, we must first understand earlier periods when artifacts and artistic representations inspired the Japanese imagination of the ideal Buddhist robe.

---

1. Following the practice established by Jaffe (1995, xvi-xvii) I will refer to modern Japanese Buddhists who have received ordination as clerics. Premodern figures may be referred to as priests (McMullin 1984, 12).

2. Except when indicated otherwise, *vinaya* citations are drawn from the *Four Part Vinaya* (*Sifen lü* 四分律, 60 fascicles; T no. 1428) commonly identified with the Dharmagupta school.

3. For example, a recent authoritative dictionary of Buddhist terms, the *Bukkyōgo daijiten* (Nakamura 1975, 1063a) defines "nyohō" as: (1) the correct way 正しい道理; (2) in accordance with the law, reason 法にかなったこと。法にかなう、理にかなうこと; according to the Dharma as the Buddha explained it 仏の説いた法のとうりの; true and correct 真正; (3) having a true meaning 正しい義をもって; (4) good things よいこと; (5) Rules and customs of the Zen school 禅門の規則や風儀にのとった.

4. In the case of robe practices in Sōtō Zen the authority of one's teacher was often valued above any text or rule established by the Sōtō school institution. See Kawaguchi's (2001, 2002) two part study of the extent of compliance to rules established by the Sōtō Zen school in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century.

5. One exception is the practice established in the Sōtō training temple, Zuiōji 瑞応寺, in Ehime prefecture, Shikoku. The practice there will be discussed in chapter five.

6. Two examples of educational websites run by commercial robe makers are: Suzuki hōiten kabushiki gaisha,"mame chishiki" 豆知識. Available on-line as of April 14, 2008 at: http://www.suzukihouiten.jp/knowledge; and Fuzoku hakubutsu kan, "nyohō e" 如法衣, available on-line as of April 14, 2008 at: http://www.iz2.or.jp/fukushoku/

7. For more information on Indian *vinaya* literature in English language sources see Nakamura (1980, 50-56); Frauwallner (1956), Prebish (1974); Holt (1991) and Schopen (1997, 2004).

8. In order to avoid confusion in discussing Japanese art and other materials concerning this figure, I will use the Japanese pronunciation of his name: Ganjin.

9. Gregory Schopen clarifies the distinction between cloth found in the charnel grounds and cloth found discarded in the road. His detailed article describes how the *vinaya* and other contemporary Buddhist texts portrayed the practice of making robes that had been in contact with the dead (Schopen 2007, 60-104).

10. For an analysis of early Buddhist practices, including that of removing cloth from graveyards, see DeCaroli (2004 55, 113, 125).

11. This definition of the pure robe follows the first definition in Nakamura (1975, 751) for *jōe* 浄衣 as: "The robe which the monk receives without hindrance; an appropriate robe (allowed by the *vinaya*)." (比丘が受けてさしすかえない衣。（律によって許された）ふさわしい衣). The second definition describes how the word "pure" was used in Japanese Buddhism to apply to certain kinds of ceremonial Buddhist robes.

12. Other lists of "four supports" address mental aspects of Buddhist teachings. See "shie" in Nakamura (2002, 410b). See also Prebish (1974, 4).

13. See also Schopen (2007, 83).

14. The Sanskrit term frequently used to refer to the set of monastic robes is *cīvara*. I will discuss the Chinese controversy over the term below.

15. The story of the Buddha looking out over the fields and approving of the design for robes also occurs in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* (fasc. 28, T 22. 454c-455a). In this version of the story, however, the Buddha explains to the monks that the field pattern for the robe was known by all the Buddhas of the past.

16. This work gives bibliographic information on the texts it cites, so it was often used as a kind of encyclopedia. Also see Kawaguchi (1976, 143).

17. Holt (1995, 134-136). A composite picture of the *kaṭhina* rite drawn from different sources is provided by Chang Kun (1957). The *kaṭhina* rite was not incorporated into Japanese Buddhism, but the annual ritual is annually performed by a Thai Buddhist organization located at the Dhammakaya Center in Osaka, Japan. Although most of the participants are Thai immigrants, a number of Japanese also attend the ceremony (Fieldnotes, November 7, 2004).

18. Matsumura (2001) discusses the origins of the story of the golden robe in India and its spread to China and Japan in the form of gold brocade.

19. Gold brocade transmission robes began to appear in Japan during the twelfth century, but were quite rare until technological advances in the Tokugawa period made them more available. The practice of wearing gold brocade robes will be discussed in chapter five.

20. The four character phrase appears throughout the *vinaya*, often in context with the thirteen ascetic practices. See "shoyoku chisoku" in Nakamura (1981, 696d).

21. See Monier-Williams, "kanthā" (1899, 249.2); and "pāṃsu-kula," (1899, 613.3). The Chinese translation of chapter four of the *Lotus Sutra* (*Saddharma puṇḍarīka-sūtra; Beihua jing* 悲華經, T 9. no. 262) translates the term *kanthā* using the characters 衲衣 (*nōe*). For an English translation that preserves the meaning of *kanthā* in this text see Hurvitz (1976, 358).

22. The Sanskrit terms for these three robes are, respectively: *antaravāsaka*, *uttaraāsaṅga* and *saṅghāṭī*.

23. Citing the *Questions of Śāriputra* (*She li fu weng jing* 舍利弗問經 T 24.901b-c), the

Edo period text, *Hōbuku kakushō*, explains that the robe is worn this way when the Buddha (or monk) is making merit, as for example, when preaching or on begging rounds (Kawaguchi 1976, 206).

24. In the first passage, the ascetic practices of Mahākāśyapa are praised; in the second passage, the disciples ask the Buddha to explain what is permissible for the "rag robe" and the "ten types of robe." The kinds of fabric listed in the different *vinaya* reflect regional variations in the kinds of available materials. See Satō (1963, 671-673).

25. Kawaguchi (1976, 317-322) discusses the details of Daoxuan's "mistake" and some of Yijing's criticisms.

26. I will discuss the complex arguments for and against the use of silk in robes in the context of Tokugawa period reform movements in chapter four.

27. For a discussion of the influence of the *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra* on arguments against meat-eating in China see Mather (1981).

28. These are also called the five simple colors, *gojunshiki* 五純色 (T 23.419b). I translate *jun* as "simple" in order to avoid confusing this term with the term "pure" (*jō* 浄) which can mean to be in accord with the *vinaya* rules. This appellation should not be confused with *junshiki e* 純色衣, a name for the undyed robes worn at state ceremonies by court monks (*kansō* 官僧).

29. Another term refers to the act of dyeing the robes: *sumizome* 墨染め, literally, dyed with ink. This term, however, was also used to refer to people who had retired from public life, not Buddhist monks.

30. For example, Saichō uses this term in his *Explication of the Precepts* (*Kenkairon* 顯戒論, fasc. 2; T 74.605c).

31. Yuanzhao's remarks appear in his commentary, *Notes to Assist in Upholding the "Four Part Vinaya Practice and Service Comments"* (*Sifenlü xingshichao zichiji* 四分律行事鈔資持記, fasc. 3; T 40.361c). It is referred to in Japanese Buddhist writings as the *Shijiki* 資持記 and was frequently cited by Tokugawa period commentaries on the *kesa.*

32. Forte (2001, 161) points out that Taoists also received purple robes, and may in fact have provided a precedent for Buddhists receiving the purple robe.

33. I will translate the term *tennō* as hereditary monarch rather than using the more common translation of "emperor." I will introduce such persons using their name and their reign dates in parentheses, e.g. (r. 1756-1789). See Hall (1983, 10) for a discussion of the translation of the term *tennō.*

34. This remark is based on personal experience. The most frequent response from Japanese acquaintances upon hearing that I was studying the *kesa* was that the color of the *kesa* indicates the rank of the monk.

35. Izutsu provides photographs of these robes, also referred to as "uncolored robes," *donjiki e* 純色衣 (Izutsu 1974, 4-5, figure series 5).

36. Matsuo Kenji (1997) argues that the white robes worn by these ritual specialists (*kansō* 官僧) in the Kamakura period symbolizes their ritual purity in contrast with the black-robed priests whose contact with women and the less fortunate would result in an impure state. His thesis, however, ignores the larger picture of the

redefinition of color and the Buddhist robes that took place in both China and Japan.

37. Future research is necessary to analyze the uses and cultural meaning of black and white vestments in Japanese religion before the introduction of Yauzhao's work.

38. Although the *Four Part Vinaya* does not stipulate the *tenjō* as a mark of the Buddhist robe, this instruction is found in the *Mahāsāṃghika vinaya* which associates it with the purity (humility) of the knife and of color (fasc. 28; T 22. 452a); and the *Sarvāstivādin vinaya*, which recommends that the mark be placed on all garments and the sleeping mat as well (fasc. 8; T 23. 556b).

Chapter 2

Ancient Textiles and Artistic Representation of the Multi-color Pieced *Kesa*

Introduction

In this chapter I consider the impact of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in Japan by examining extant artifacts and *kesa* representation in sculpture and painting. The ancient textiles and artworks discussed in this chapter fundamentally shaped the conception of the *kesa* in Japan and are used as authentic models in *kesa* sewing groups. Until the nineteenth century these eighth century *kesa* were referred to as pieced robes (*nōe/nōgesa*). Throughout this chapter I will refer to these artifacts as multi-color pieced robes, even though the popular trend since the nineteenth century has been to call them *funzōe*. The reasons for this shift in naming conventions and its impact on the modern understanding of these artifacts will be discussed in the final section of the chapter.

The ancient textiles traditionally referred to as pieced robes are made in a wide variety of ways that are meant to evoke the ancient practice of wearing robes made of discarded scraps, closely associated with Śākyamuni Buddha. As I have already discussed, the production of pieced robes made of brightly colored cloth is validated by the *vinaya* itself. To regard these elaborately designed *kesa* as a degeneration ignores this fact. Whether originally made on the continent or in Japan, these *kesa* show an impressive range of approaches to the multi-colored pieced robe in the East Asian Buddhist tradition and are valued as the personal possessions of two figures who shaped the early state: Shōtoku *taishi* 聖徳太子 (574-622) and the monarch, Shōmu *tennō* 聖武天王 (701-756; r. 724-749).[1] I will treat these garments as "*kesa* in Japan" rather than "Japanese *kesa*," leaving the question of their provenance to textile experts.[2]

The cultural influence of the multi-colored pieced *kesa* is not limited to *kesa* artifacts and the legends attached to them. In the Kamakura period Shōtoku is regularly

depicted in portraits wearing a multi-color pieced robe, just as are the founders of Japanese Buddhist schools and Hachiman 八幡, who was regarded as a bodhisattva.[3] Art works meticulously depicted precise construction details of the multi-color stitched and pieced robe, including the running stitch that covers the surface of the cloth. This chapter considers the role of the multi-colored pieced *kesa* by examining the physical properties and cultural meanings of the extant textiles and the depiction of this type of *kesa* in Japanese art.

Part 1. Ancient *kesa* in Japan

The earliest reference to the *nōgesa* in Japanese history is in connection with rituals for the preservation of the state. *Nihon shoki* 日本書紀 records that the female monarch, Saimei 斉明 (594-661), held the first ceremonial reading of the *Benevolent Kings Scripture* (*Renwang bore boluomi jing* 佛説仁王般若波羅蜜經, T 8. no. 245) during the fifth month for which one hundred *nōgesa* were made for the participating monks (*Nihon shoki*, fasc. 26, number 17; in Sakamoto 1967, 343; Aston 1956, 2.264-265).[4] The *Benevolent Kings Scripture*, venerated by the Japanese in rituals for protecting the nation, was used in state rituals, including accession rites for a new monarch, through the 15th century.[5] The scripture contains specific instructions for the ritual, including the kinds of images, and seats as well as the *nōgesa* (De Visser 1935, 132-135; Kim 1994, 100). The physical garments used in these early rituals do not appear to have survived but the use of the term *nōgesa* indicates that this type of *kesa* was considered appropriate to this ceremony, closely associated with the preservation of the state and the sovereign.

The earliest extant multi-color pieced robes in Japan date from the seventh to ninth centuries and are preserved at Hōryūji 法隆寺, whose founding is traditionally associated with Shōtoku; and at the Shōsōin 正倉院, the treasure house of Tōdaiji that

was established by Shōmu's consort after his death. The exact provenance of these textiles is not certain, but the method of construction reflects continental techniques (Yoneda 1999, 47). Wherever they were made, the fact that these pieced *kesa* were preserved in these collections and are believed to have been worn by Shōmu and Shōtoku during their lifetime indicates the high regard that this type of *kesa* commanded. In addition to the *kesa* in these collections, we will also consider two multi-color pieced *kesa* whose origin has been piously attributed to Tang China: the pieced *kesa* at Enryakuji 延暦寺 that Saichō 最澄 (767-822), regarded as the founder of the Tendai school, received from his Chinese teacher, Xingman 行満 (c.768-823); and a pieced and stitched *kesa* at Tōji 東寺 that Kūkai 空海 (774-835), the founder of the Shingon school, received from his Chinese teacher, Huiguo 惠果 (746-805).

Modern studies of these *kesa* textiles became possible during the late nineteenth century when they came to be seen as national cultural assets. Before this process began, however, the *kesa* were viewed as religious treasures of the temple that had preserved them. Depending on the circumstances, the *kesa* were either hidden from view in treasure houses (Shōsōin and, to a lesser extent, Tōji), ignored (Enryakuji) or enthusiastically displayed as religious treasures for fund-raising purposes (Hōryūji). These different premodern circumstances are an important aspect of the history of each of the pieces. In the following section I discuss the multi-color pieced *kesa* held at these four sites and the social and religious practices connected with them.

Kesa in the Hōryūji collection

The two multi-color pieced *kesa* in the Hōryūji collection are traditionally attributed to Śākyamuni and Shōtoku. In the following discussion I will refer to these as the Śākyamuni *kesa* and the Shōtoku *kesa*.[6] After describing the physical characteristics of

the two pieced *kesa* in the Hōryūji collection I examine the legendary explanations attached to these artifacts. The two *kesa* were listed in the three hundred objects given by Hōryūji to the Imperial Household Agency in 1878 and were subsequently included in the 1947 list of national treasures donated by Hōryuji when ownership of the collection was transferred to the government (Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 1975, 1; hereafter, TKH). In the 1970's when contemporary art historians began to study them, these two *kesa* had been stored together in a single box (Kiuchi and Sawada 1978, 4).[7]

The Shōtoku pieced linen *kesa* is a mere 107 cm. vertical, compared to the average of 140 cm for the *kesa* stored at the Shōsōin (Kiuchi 1978, 10).[8] Scholars estimate that the undamaged *kesa* would have measured 143 cm in the vertical dimension, *tate* 縦; and 266 in the horizontal dimension, *yoko* 横.[9] The dimensions are defined by how the *kesa* is worn. The shorter dimension that covers roughly from the shoulder to below the knees is referred to as the vertical dimension, and the wide length of the *kesa* that wraps around the body is referred to as the horizontal dimension. The seven panels of the *kesa* that comprise the horizontal dimension are each composed of two long and one short piece that have been pieced together from small patches of linen fabric that has now faded to light blue, purple and brown. These small patches are irregular and the edges are curved, much like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, suggesting that the patches were cut, not torn (Lyman 1984, 30). The layering of the pieces on the light brown backing is quite dense and various colors are piled one upon another. A small portion of the border of dark blue linen remains. A finely sewn, consistent running stitch covers the entire surface. The places where this stitching is less dense and fine are thought to be portions of the *kesa* where the individual panels were sewn together (Kiuchi 1978, 11; Matsumura 1998, 30).[10] It is difficult to determine from written descriptions and photographic reproductions whether the panels were originally sewn together in overlapping seams or whether strip seams were used.[11]

In spite of its association with Shōtoku, this *kesa* is identified in modern scholarship and museum descriptions as a Nara period textile, not a textile of the Asuka period when Shōtoku lived. It is likely that a positive identification of these ancient *kesa* is hindered by the lack of extant textiles of this type and period in China for comparison, and the consequent difficulties in establishing clear typological categories for the multi-color pieced *kesa*.[12]

The second robe, the Śākyamuni multi-color pieced *kesa*, is made of patches of silk cut irregularly and sewn in overlapping layers.[13] Scholars agree that the original *kesa* was made in the strip seam technique, although the strips for the seams have been lost. The colors of the silk patches include light blue, ochre, dark brown, purple and green. The entire surface is covered in a fine running stitch using a double reverse twist thread (*moriyori ito* 諸撚糸) in blue and yellow (Matsumura 1998, 30).[14] The fineness and consistency of the stitch is a remarkable achievement, given how thick the layered patches are. Kiuchi speculates that the maker used a long needle and a technique of sewing called *gushinui* ぐし縫い in which the needle moves through the fabric without drawing the thread through for each stitch (Kiuchi 1978, 8).[15] In modern Japanese hand sewing the *gushinui* stitch is used to produce a straight line of small stitches that reduces the chance of the double threads twisting and knotting. This same technique is used for the running stitch called *sashiko* 刺し子, used in making *funzōe* in contemporary *kesa* sewing groups (Okamoto Kōbun 岡本光文 personal communication, June, 2005).[16]

Nara period documents refer to *kesa* owned by Hōryūji. The first reference is in a catalogue of Hōryūji treasures that was initiated by the government in 747 and called, *List of [Hōryūji] Treasures Monastery and a List of Its Accumulated Treasures* (*Hōryūji garan engi narabini ryūki shizai chō* 法隆寺伽藍縁起並流記資財帳, hereafter *List of [Hōryūji] Treasures*).[17] The list of eleven *kesa* by type includes:

two human sized *kesa*, [approximately eight feet horizontally]: one brocade pieced robe, and one robe of reddish black with white strip seams;

five Buddha sized *kesa* [approximately sixteen feet horizontally]: one linen, one red, one purple gauze, and two horse chestnut color;

one *nōgesa* of linen said to be for Maitreya, the future Buddha;

three plain *kesa*, two of reddish brown fabric, and one bluish brown. (DNB 117.10-11; Izutsu 1965, 76).[18]

Out of this group of eleven, only the "brocade pieced robe" approximates the description of the Śākyamuni *kesa*, but the silk in this extant *kesa* is not brocade. The linen *kesa* designated as for "Maitreya," is the only close match for the extant *kesa* now known as the Shōtoku *kesa*. In addition, although the text lists eleven *kesa*, two of which are pieced *kesa* (*nōgesa*), none are specifically identified as the Śākyamuni and Shōtoku *kesa*. It is not possible to confirm, therefore, that the two extant Hōryūji *kesa* are the same as the ones described in the earliest record, *List of [Hōryūji] Treasures.* In spite of these discrepancies, modern Japanese scholars continue to cite the list of eleven *kesa* in *List of [Hōryūji] Treasures* as evidence that the extant Hōryūji Śākyamuni and Shōtoku *kesa* date to the eighth century.[19]

List of [Hōryūji] Treasures does not stray from straightforward physical descriptions of the *kesa*, but by the late Heian period it is clear that attitudes toward the treasures of Hōryūji had shifted. The twelfth century work, *Selections from the Record of Past and Present Legends of Prince Shōtoku* (*Shōtoku taishi den kokon mokuroku shō* 聖徳太子伝古今目録抄, hereafter, *Past and Present Legends*), attributed to Kenshin 顯眞 (c.1227-1262), a priest at Hōryūji, crafts a more detailed history for the Śākyamuni *kesa*.[20] The Śākyamuni *kesa* appears in the list of objects in the Relics hall, *Shariden* 舍利殿, as follows (parenthetical comments reproduce the text as printed):

Next, *nōgesa* from Gandhara, used when [Shōtoku] lectured on the Scripture of

Queen Śrīmālā, also holding a fly whisk as in Tang [China] (It was a possession from a former life).

次乾陀羅國衲袈裟、又以（用）此袈裟ヲ勝鬘經講讀ト云、此モ只如ク云ベシ (唐塵尾先生所持物). (Ogino 1980, 9).[21]

The passage establishes a link between the *nōgesa* and one of the iconic stances of Shōtoku: his lecture on the *Scripture of Queen Śrīmālā,* which is said to have lasted for three days.[22] A commentary on this scripture is also attributed to Shōtoku (Wayman 1974, 13-15). By claiming that the *nōgesa* is from Gandhara, Kenshin also implies a link between Shōtoku and Śākyamuni Buddha. The same description occurs again in *Past and Present Legends*, immediately preceding a description of Shōtoku's purported previous incarnation as the Chinese master, Nanyue Huisi 南嶽慧思 (515-577) who was revered as one of the founders of the Tiantai (Japanese, Tendai) school (Ogino 1980, 35). The legend of Shōtoku's former life as Huisi was well known in Japan as early as the latter half of the eighth century, having been recounted in a biography of the Chinese *vinaya* master, Jianzhen (鑑真 688-763; hereafter Ganjin), *Record of the Great Tang Priest's Eastward Journey* (*Tōdaiwajō tōseiden* 唐大和上東征伝, T 51. no. 2089; hereafter, *Journey to the East*) compiled in 779 by Ōmi no Mifune 淡海三船 (722-785).[23] On the one hand, Kenshin's claim that the *kesa* and the fly whisk were "owned in a previous life" hints at the legend of Shōtoku's previous incarnation as Huisi, but it also elevates these two objects as relics of that former life. Like Shōtoku, the *kesa* has also journeyed from India and China to Japan.

Legendary accounts of Shōtoku spread throughout society during the medieval period, particularly among the upper classes. The powerful regent Fujiwara Michinaga 藤原道長 (966-1027) is credited with promoting ideas about the sanctity of Shōtoku, and there is evidence that objects that were closely connected with Shōtoku were displayed to the nobility during the Heian period for their edification (Ogino 1980, 5). The

Śākyamuni *kesa*, among other Hōryūji treasures, was periodically sent to the palace for admiration and for the spiritual benefits of seeing them (Higuchi 1979, 29).

By the late Tokugawa period the identity of the group of seven holy treasures, *shichi reibō* 七霊宝, was firmly established. The *Handbook of Ancient Matters of Ikaruga Temple* (*Ikarugadera koji benran* 斑鳩寺古事便覧, hereafter *Handbook of Ikarugadera*), published in 1836 by Kakuken 覺賢 (fl. 1836), shows the increasing specificity and complexity of the legendary material of the Śākyamuni *kesa*. Citing Kenshin's *Past and Present Legends*, Kakuken explains the lineage of the ownership of the *kesa*:

> *Nōgesa*, which Śākyamuni himself bestowed on Queen Śrīmālā. It had been owned by Prince [Shōtoku] in a previous life. It was an item brought back [from China] by Emissary Ono no Ōmi Imoko. The *Kokon mokuroku shō* [*Past and Present Legends*] states that it was used in Gandhāra [by Śākyamuni] when he preached the Scripture of Queen Śrīmālā.
>
> 衲袈裟、自釋尊授勝鬘天人太子前生所持、妹子臣将来品也、古今目録抄乾陀羅國佛勝万[sic]經講讃之時所用云。(DNB 117, 85)

Kakuken's comments condense a number of legends about the Śākyamuni *kesa* and go much farther than the *Past and Present Legends* by boldly claiming historical credentials for the *kesa*. The *Handbook of Ikarugadera* first strengthens the link with Śākyamuni by asserting that the *kesa* was given to Queen Śrimala by the Buddha. The passage then strengthens the legend of Shōtoku's former life as Huisi in China, by adding details about how the Śākyamuni *kesa* was brought by the emissary, Omonoimoko. Compared to Kenshin's simple assertion in *Past and Present Legends* that the *kesa* belonged to Shōtoku in a previous life, Kakuken provides us with names and dates, incorporating various legends to propose an historical identity for the Hōryūji Śākyamuni *kesa*. In addition to this illustrious lineage for the Śākyamuni *kesa*, Kakuken emphasizes that the source of

the seven treasures' power comes from the objects' physical contact with Shōtoku. For example, the text explains that the copy of the *Fanwan jing* in the collection is valued not merely as a scripture, but because when Shōtoku himself wrote out the title, his hand brushed the page. The implication is that, like objects used or viewed by the Buddha, objects that Shōtoku used acquire the status of contact relics.[24]

These two multi-color pieced *kesa* in the Hōryūji collection that are so closely identified with Shōtoku developed quite different biographies. Although the linen *kesa* is eventually identified as "Shōtoku's *kesa*" it is not featured in exhibits until the Meiji period, and it does not have the complex identity of the Śākyamuni *kesa*. It is likely that the vague provenance of both of these *kesa* allows them to become a focus for legends about Shōtoku. The Śākyamuni *kesa* was viewed by an increasing number of people as a repository of Shōtoku's personal charisma, and the reverence toward this artifact endured from Heian period to the present. We now turn to the *kesa* of the Shōsōin collection whose structural variations raise a different set of questions about the structure and meaning of the multi-color pieced robe.

Multi-colored pieced *kesa* in the Shōsōin collection

The provenance of the Shōsōin *kesa* are more certain, thanks to the meticulous care and record-keeping that is characteristic of this collection. The items in the Shōsōin collection fall into three categories. First, items that were directly connected to Shōmu and his consort, Kōmyō 光明 (701-760) were recorded in the *Record of Imperial Treasures* (*Kokka chinbō chō* 国家珍宝帳) as her gift to Tōdaiji after the death of Shōmu. The other two categories are items used in ceremonies at Tōdaiji and items connected to the administration of Tōdaiji whose provenance can be established through sources other than Tōdaiji's records (Yoneda 1998, 8). Access to the collection was

strictly controlled and the doors of the storehouse could not be opened without permission from the royal court.

Nine *kesa* that are believed to have been the personal possessions of Shōmu, are listed at the beginning of the *Record of Imperial Treasures.* One is a multi-colored *kesa* made of nine panels; the remaining eight are seven panel *kesa*, six of which are called stitched and pieced, bark color *kesa* (*shichijō shinō juhishoku* 七条刺衲樹皮色袈裟). The compound *shinō* refers to the use of many different colors of fiber or cloth (*nō* 衲) and the use of the piercing or running stitch (*shi* 刺) to cover the surface of the cloth. The mottled brown, green, blue and ochre colored pattern of the irregular patches resembles tree bark (*juhi shoku* 樹皮色).[25] The two remaining seven-panel *kesa* use different techniques: one is a tapestry weave that imitates the pattern of the bark-colored pieced *kesa* and the other arranges the pieces of cloth into a pattern of mountains, often referred to as the far mountain (*tōyama*) design. Official publications of the Shōsōin use the traditional name of *shinō* for the pieced *kesa* and *shokusei*, 織成, for the woven *kesa* (Shōsōin jimusho, 1960-1964, 3.264, XI).

The three *kesa* in this group of nine that attract the most scholarly attention are the nine panel pieced *kesa*, the woven *kesa*, and the seven panel pieced *kesa* whose pattern resembles mountain shapes.[26] Each of the three *kesa* exemplify different artistic and technological approaches to the pieced robe. The nine panel *kesa* is similar to the Hōryūji multi-color pieced *kesa*. It is made of white, yellow, green, light blue, dark blue, brown, and purple pieces of silk sewn together in overlapping layers with a running stitch overall. The backing for the *kesa*, which measures 147cm. by 251.5 cm., is blue-green twill weave silk with a pattern of rhomboids (Shōsōin jimusho, 3.264, XI). The panels are sewn with the overlapping seams of the cut-and-sewn method described in chapter one. This intact *kesa* with its vibrant colors gives a clearer idea of what the Hōryūji *kesa* might be had they been so well protected.

The woven (*shokusei* 織成) *kesa* uses a tapestry weave that employs a double weft (horizontal) thread. A light blue weft thread covers the entire horizontal ground, while paired weft threads in different colors of navy, green, yellow, white, brown, and red create a pattern on the surface. The weaving uses a technique of changing weft colors by folding back the paired threads of one color before taking up a different pair of colored threads. This leaves a series of small holes where the thread color changes. This method of changing color in tapestry is characteristic of the *kesi* 緯糸 (Japanese, *nukiito*) weaving technique that was introduced to China from western Asia in the Tang period and became quite popular in the Song and Qing periods.[27] During the Song the *kesi* technique was used to make elaborate patterns and pictorial representations because of the crisp definition that could be made between the colors.[28] The *shokusei kesa* shows distinct borders of colors, woven in irregular shapes that resemble patches, but because of the different colored weft pairs and the blue weft ground, the overall appearance has a subtle blending of colors over a pale brown warp thread (vertical) ground.

Finally, the so-called far mountain *kesa* is made of different colored bits of layered cloth covered with a running stitch in which the placement of the patches of cloth make a pattern of overlapping mountain peaks. Matsumura (1998, 28-36), who consistently refers to these *kesa* as *funzōe* rather than *nōe* or *nōgesa*, identifies three types of design extant in Japan: bark pattern, cloud pattern and mountain pattern. She argues that the design elements in medieval Japanese *kesa* textiles can be traced to depictions of *kesa* in illustrations of the Buddha's life and of his disciples in the caves of Dunhuang in western China.[29] While the far mountain design does not appear in domestic Japanese *kesa* textiles until the later medieval period, according to Matsumura, Tang period paintings clearly show the far mountain design, roughly contemporaneous with the extant eighth century textiles examined above.[30]

The Enryakuji and Tōji kesa

Two essential differences set the Tōji and Enryakuji multi-colored pieced *kesa* apart from those we have considered so far: first, they are not connected with the ruling line of Shōmu or Shōtoku; and second, their identity as Tang Chinese textiles is a key factor in their religious significance. These *kesa*, given as a sign of transmission of Buddhist teachings from master to disciple (*denbō e* 伝法衣), were documented with other items brought back from China by Saichō and Kūkai on their return as proof of the authenticity of the transmission of the teachings. Their physical construction also includes elements not seen in the multi-colored pieced *kesa* described thus far.

The seven panel multi-color pieced *kesa* believed to be the one that Saichō received from his Chinese teacher, Xingman, is currently stored at Enryakuji on Mt. Hiei (Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 2005, plates 33 and 34; hereafter KKH). It was recognized in 1963 during an investigation of cultural treasures at the temple, and by 1969 the *kesa* was restored to its former state by removing pieces that had been added on in later periods (Kirihata 1988, 1). The original construction was the strip seam method in which appliqued strips mark out the field portion of each panel as well as separating the seven panels from each other. In the Enryakuji *kesa* an open weave light brown cloth is the base on which white, whitish brown, brown, light blue and pale purple dyed linen fibers are laid to construct the field portions of the *kesa*.[31] Small bits of purple linen cloth are scattered on the surface and the whole is held in place with a fine running stitch sewn with pale blue linen thread. The brown linen strip seams and border are sewn onto this face using the open seam method (*kaiyō* 開葉) which allows regular gaps in the closing seam (KHK 2005, 312).[32] On the backing there is a reinforced patch which indicates that ties were used to fasten the *kesa* rather than the more common ring and loop system. The border of the *kesa*, which contains inscriptions describing its lineage, dates

to the Kamakura period (Kirihata 1988, 2). This *kesa* is not made from patches of cloth sewn together like the *kesa* discussed above. Rather, it is composed of bits of fiber secured to the backing with the running stitch, a construction that challenges the notion of the "pieced robe" made of cloth scraps.

Although the *kesa* at first appears to have been made without design, the arrangement of the colored silk floss is subtle and resembles misty clouds. Kirihata (1988, 1) sees intentionality in the arrangement of the fibers, pointing out pictorial designs in the central panel. He suggests that in the second section from the top there is a temple building with a navy roof and pale purple doors and two seated Buddha figures inside the doors. Fluffy white clouds float above the roof. I was not aware of this interpretation when I saw the *kesa* on display at Enryakuji in 2002 and I find it difficult to discern this image of a temple and Buddha figures in photographs. There is apparently a modern interest in ascribing artistic and even symbolic intent to the crafting of these *kesa*. Kirihata takes it for granted that this *kesa* artifact is the so-called transmission *kesa* that Saichō claims to have received in China, but the evidence for a positive identification is not so clear.

The existence of a transmission *kesa* was recorded by Saichō in his 811 work, *Catalogue of Scriptures, Treasures, and Holy Teachings* (*Go kyōzō hōmotsu seikyō tō mokuroku* 御経蔵宝物聖教等目録), where he describes the *kesa* as: "One transmission pieced *kesa* (*nōgesa*), received for posterity from the storehouse of Master Jingxi of Fulong" (*Keikei wajō butsuryū zō fuhō kesa einō ichiryō* 荊鶏和上佛隴藏付法袈裟永納壹領, DDZ 4.347).[33] The pedigree of the transmission *kesa* is also inscribed on the upper border: "Received from Great Teacher, Jingxi;" and on the bottom of the left hand border: "Received from Great Teacher Jingxi and offered to Fulong (temple)." Saichō's record and these two inscriptions identify the *kesa* as having originally belonged to

Jingxi, the sixth patriarch of the Tiantai school, usually referred to as Zhanran 湛然 (711-782), who was the teacher of Saichō's teacher, Xingman. It also identifies the *kesa* as a transmission *kesa* (*fuhō kesa* 付法袈裟). Leaving out Xingman's name seems to suggest that the *kesa* represents a direct transmission between Zhanran and Saichō (Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 2005, 312; hereafter, KKH). Indeed, Xingman's name does not appear in any of these identifying marks on the Kamakura era border of the *kesa*, perhaps an indication of the tendency in the Tendai school to minimize the importance of Xingman's influence (Groner 1984, 45-46). It is not uncommon, however, for a transmission *kesa* to be identified with the bestower's teacher as proof of three generations of lineage.[34] The *Tendai Kahyō*, an encyclopedic work compiled from 1771-1862 which provides biographical details for over one hundred fifty eminent monks in the Tendai lineage, does recognize Xingman's role in bestowing the *kesa* on Saichō (KKH 2005, 312).[35] Even if the inscriptions on the *kesa* date some five hundred years after Saichō lived, their duplication in Saichō's record serves as confirmation of the identity of the *kesa* sufficient to have discouraged later generations from adding meanings of their own. Compared to the growing legends about the Śākyamuni *kesa* at Hōryūji, the meaning ascribed to the Enryakuji *kesa* was relatively stable.

Finally, the woven *kesa* that Kūkai received from his Chinese teacher, Huiguo provides a second example of a woven representation of the pieced *kesa* (Sawa 1969, plates 209 and 210). Kūkai recorded the *kesa* as the *kenda kokushi kesa* 乾陀穀子 in his *Record of Imports* (*Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請來目録) that he submitted to the government shortly after his return to Japan (T 55.1065a). The *kesa* is included in a list of five objects that he received as part of his transmission from Huiguo. Kūkai simply lists the objects, making no comment about the name *kenda kokushi* ascribed to the *kesa* nor about the meaning of receiving the *kesa* as part of the transmission.

The *kesa* measures 115 cm by 272 cm and is currently stored at Tōji.[36] The weaving uses the weft faced tapestry technique called *kesi,* similar to the Shōsōin woven *kesa* discussed above. In the Tōji *kesa,* however, the weaver used the gaps created by the turning back of the threads in the *kesi* technique in order to loop a knot onto the surface of the cloth. These knots give the appearance of the fine lines of running stitch on the surface of a pieced and stitched (*shinō*) *kesa.*[37] The colors in the *kesa,* though now faded, would have been quite brilliant in Kūkai's time.

The meaning of the name *kenda kokushi* has never been resolved (Sawa 1969, 328-329). One traditional interpretation is that the word *kenda* refers to Gandhara, i.e. India. Another claims that *kenda* is a transliteration of the Sanskrit term for the dye color known in Japanese as *mokuran* (Izutsu 1965, 116). Some scholars question the latter explanation primarily because the *kesa* itself is not in the range of reddish yellow to maroon colors defined as *mokuran.* Sawa suggests that *kenda* is a transliteration of the Sanskrit word, *kanthā,* which refers in general to clothing made from scraps without the restrictions and the implied ascetic lifestyle of the *pāṃsukūla.*[38]

The second half of the name, *kokushi,* is also problematic. Traditional explanations use the meaning of the first character, "grain," to suggest that the name refers to a type of gauze called *komeori* 米織り. The fabric of the field portion of the *kesa,* however, is by no means lightweight or loosely woven like gauze; it is a tapestry weave. Izutsu suggests that the name, meaning rice grain, might refer to the design element of the "stitches" woven into the cloth (Izutsu 1965, 116). Sawa, however, proposes that there was a homophonic transcription error in which the Chinese compound for *kesi* tapestry, 刻糸 (Japanese, *kokushi*) was written as 穀子: grain + seed, also pronounced *kokushi.* In Sawa's analysis of the two compounds that make up the name, therefore, *kenda* indicates a "robe made from scraps" and *kokushi* refers to a type of

tapestry weave (Sawa 1969, 328). The two compounds together create a descriptive name for the *kesa* that is physically accurate: "a tapestry weave pieced *kesa*."

Although Sawa is cautious, his interpretation of the name avoids the contradictions of traditional explanations. More significantly, the revised name suggests that the original Chinese name was both descriptive (a *kesi* weave) and mindful of the semantic differences of the two Sanskrit words discussed in chapter one: *kanthā* and *pāṃsukula*. The name *kenda kokushi* thus defines this *kesa* as a *kanthā* robe, meaning a garment made of scraps. It is not, however, a *pāṃsukula*, a rag robe. If Sawa's analysis is correct, this would seem to suggest that the Chinese knew the difference between a *kesa* made of scraps and a *kesa* made according to the ascetic practice described in the *vinaya*. The fact that later generations equate *nōe* with *funzōe* makes it more difficult to see what the name *kenda kokushi* can tell us about the Chinese understanding of these distinctions.

Although Kūkai makes no comment about the role of the *kenda kokushi* in transmission, the *Record of Eastern Treasures* (*Tobōki* 東宝記) emphasizes its value as a sign of transmission (fasc. 12; in *Zoku zoku gunsho ruijū* 1969-1978, 48-49). This text, a consolidation of diaries, records and legends concerning Tōji, was compiled in 1352 by Gōhō 果宝 (1306-1362) at the request of the chief priest of Ninnaji 仁和寺. The *kenda kokushi* is listed in the second division of Buddhist treasures, along with other items of transmission. Gōhō's comments about the *kenda kokushi* show his knowledge of the Zen school's conception of the *kesa* as a sign of transmission of the teaching from master to disciple.[39]

Access to the *kenda kokushi* was strictly controlled. It was used periodically in state rituals, for example in the Latter Seven Day Rite (*Goshichinichi no mishiho* 後七日御修法), a kingly empowerment rite that is still performed in the first month of each new

year (Rambelli 2002, 432).[40] Although access to the *kenda kokushi* was controlled, Gōhō reports that in the sixth month of 1329 a band of thieves broke into the Tōji storehouse, stole the *kesa* and tore off the silk backing. A week later a temple monk who was washing rice found the discarded face of the *kesa* in the vicinity of the temple. The thieves kept the uncut fabric of the lining but apparently saw no profit in the pieced face of the *kesa*, thus demonstrating that even this highly crafted *kesa* still conveyed a fundamental aspect of the Buddhist *kesa*: its lack of worldly value.

Shifts in Meaning: Displaying *Kesa* Artifacts in Premodern and Modern Times

The *kesa* belonging to Hōryūji were the first *kesa* textiles to make the transition from temple treasures to national cultural treasures. In 1878 Hōryūji presented approximately three hundred of its treasures to the Imperial Household, receiving 10,000 yen in return.[41] Most of the objects were Buddhist paintings, sculptures, and ritual implements, a few of which date to the beginning of the seventh century. In the nineteenth century, world exhibitions and museums were coming into vogue in the West. In order to modernize and compete on a level with Western powers, Japan felt the need to display not only its domestic products but also objects that would demonstrate its eminence as an ancient culture. Although the primary motivation behind their participation was to increase industry and trade, there was also an element of national pride in maintaining and displaying its cultural artifacts, preserved over many centuries. Because many of the treasures housed at Hōryūji were connected with Shōtoku, revered as the father of the nation, the Hōryūji collection was particularly important to the new government. Unlike the Tokugawa government which was mainly interested in the temples' continuing upkeep of objects associated with the bakufu, the Meiji government was interested in preserving these treasures as a national cultural legacy (McDermott 2006 342).

This nationalistic display of the objects was prefigured by events held by temples during the Tokugawa period. Displays of temple treasures were held at the home temple (*igaichō* 居開帳) or were held at remote locations (*degaichō* 出開帳), often in the city of Edō (Kornicki 1994, 175).[42] Both types of display were held with minimal interference from the bakufu, which did not seek ownership or control of the objects. Rather, it encouraged temples to show their treasures as a fund-raising effort for maintaining the temple grounds and buildings (TKH 1996, 8). The majority of traveling displays that came to Edō took place either at Asakusadera 浅草寺 or at Ekō-in 回向院. Ekō-in was particularly popular as an exhibition site: as many as one hundred and sixty-six were held during the Tokugawa period. The temple was built near the mass grave for more than one hundred thousand residents of Edo who perished in the great fire of 1657 (Meireki *no taika* 明暦の大火), which had destroyed sixty percent of Edō's buildings. Originally non-denominational, Ekō-in was built for the sole purpose of performing religious services for the victims of the fire which had destroyed entire families, leaving no relatives to perform memorials. A bridge spanning the Sumida river was built soon after the fire, connecting two regions of Edō and providing a natural meeting place for tradesmen and travellers. As an exhibition space, therefore, Ekō-in was non-sectarian and offered the advantages of the high traffic of a crossroads.

Hōryūji's first exhibition in Edō took place in 1694 at Ekō-in, organized by the fifth Shōgun, Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉 (r.1680-1709) and his mother, Keishōin 桂昌院 (1607-1705). The purpose of the exhibition was to raise funds for the restoration of Hōryūji.[43] Partly due to the support of the royal family, this exhibit was the most lucrative of the three Hōryūji exhibitions held during the Edō period. The exhibition was held from the seventh to the ninth months and was so profitable to the townspeople living near the temple that they requested an extension of an additional month (TKH 1996, 8). Keishōin herself made a donation of three hundred ryō and ordered lacquer boxes to be

made for each of the seven treasures (Higuchi 1979, 29-31). Twenty-six items were exhibited, with the relics of the Buddha as the main attraction. Seven items had already been identified as the set of "Seven Holy Treasures" of Shōtoku. Included in this set of seven holy treasures was the pieced *kesa* called the "Śākyamuni *kesa*" described above. The items displayed in this first exhibition became the core group of Hōryūji treasures and were shown at subsequent exhibitions at Ekō-in in 1800 and in 1842, each time for sixty days.[44] When Hōryūji submitted its list of treasures to the Meiji government in 1871, seventy five percent of the items listed had already been shown at traveling displays.

The reputation of the Seven Treasures was augmented and popularized in the catalogues that accompanied later exhibits (Kiuchi 1978, 5). Descriptions of the seven holy treasures in nineteenth century catalogues show a strong reliance on Kakuken's 1836 *Handbook of Ancient Matters of Ikaruga temple.* For example, in 1694 the *Record of traveling exhibits* (*Degaichō mokuroku* 出開帳目録) simply designated the *kesa* as "Śākyamuni's *kesa*," whereas the catalogue for the 1843 display at Ekō-in, the *Illustrations of Treasures* (*Ohō motsu zūe* 御宝物図絵), describes the *kesa* as "*nōgesa*, the *kesa* that Śākyamuni bestowed on Queen Śrīmālā," with the explanation that Shōtoku himself had worn the *kesa* (Higuchi 1979, 29).

Exhibition catalogues and the designation of the name, *funzōe*

In addition to the growing complexity of legends about the Śākyamuni *kesa*, nineteenth century exhibition catalogues also begin to refer to both the Śākyamuni and Shōtoku *kesa* as *funzōe,* rather than using the traditional appellation, *nōgesa.* The *Illustrations of Hōryūji Objects* (*Hōryūji jūmotsu zu* 法隆寺什物図, 1843) uses the designation *funzōe,* completely abandoning the traditional term, *nōgesa.* Throughout the Meiji period both

terms are used, sometimes in the same description, as in the catalogue for the 1876 Nara exhibit, *Nara hakurankai motsuhin mokuroku* 奈良博覧会物品目録, which mixes the terms *nōgesa* and *funzōe* in the same sentence: "*Nōgesa*; one box. (A yellow ground far mountain (*kesa*) which temple tradition says is Śākyamuni's *funzōe*) (Sawada 2001, 92; item no. N33)."[45] The use of the designation *funzōe* is not limited to the Śākyamuni *kesa*. Meiji period catalogues of Hōryūji treasures also refer to the Shōtoku *kesa* as a *funzōe* (Sawada 2001, 92; item no N34). This new preference for the term *funzōe* thus coincides with the historical elevation of the Hōryūji treasures from temple treasures to objects that convey national cultural pride.

The reasons for the shift in terminology from *nōgesa* to *funzōe* are not clear, and it is unremarked in texts of the period. Compared to the relatively self-explanatory *nōgesa* (or *nōe*), which can be parsed as "*kesa* (or robe) made from scraps," the meaning of the term *funzōe* is not immediately obvious. Taking the meaning of the characters at face value, *funzōe* translates as "shit wiping robe." The term *funzōe* is seldom seen in public references to *kesa* before the eighteenth century. It is true that Dōgen had used the term extensively in his two essays on the *kesa* written in 1241, but these essays were not widely published and would have had little impact on popular understanding of the *kesa*.[46]

As noted in the previous chapter, Yuanzhao's work, *Six Possessions of the Buddhist Monk* was taken as an authoritative and accessible explanation of the Buddhist robe during the medieval period. In this work, however, Yuanzhao mentions the term *funzōe* only once, indicating briefly that this method of obtaining robes was frequently practiced by the eminent monks of India:

> [My] explanation of seeking robe materials is divided into two types. First: I clarify seeking (begging) and avoiding errors. This derives from [the fact] that the

dharma robe material must be pure. Eminent monks of India to the West mostly [used] discarded rag robes. Now [those who] wish to accord with the *dharma* merely avoid false seeking.

明求財分二。初明求乞離過。由是法衣體須清浄。西梵高僧。多捨糞掃衣。今欲如法。但離邪求。(T 45.898a).

Yuanzhao's brief remark categorizes the practice of wearing rag robes as an ancient practice of India. His implication is that although venerable, this type of robe practice is no longer appropriate. Throughout his commentary, Yuanzhao focuses on the details of making and wearing monastic robes, and the term *funzōe* does not appear again. Japanese scholar monks who relied on Yuanzhao's explanation of Daoxuan's teachings on the robe would hardly be encouraged to even think about the rag robe, let alone make one. Yet, the term *funzōe* begins to be used more widely during the Tokugawa period. What is the source for this shift toward using the term *funzōe* in place of *nōe* to refer to these ancient textiles?

The Shingon scholar-monk Jiun Onkō may have influenced the adoption of the term *funzōe* in regard to these two Hōryūji *kesa*. After viewing the linen Shōtoku *kesa* in 1756 Jiun wrote up his observations, referring to the *kesa* as a *funzōe* (JSZ 1.329).[47] Jiun had also vowed to produce one thousand *kesa* according to his understanding of the *vinaya* for the sake of his ordained followers and for future generations. Participants in this project made different types of robes, including multi-color pieced robes which they identified as *funzōe* in their records (JSZ 16.39).[48] Jiun's teachings were spread by his followers, which included noble born laywomen and nuns. Jiun's use of the word *funzōe* both in his report of the Shōtoku *kesa* and in reference to robes that he was producing would therefore have reached the higher ranking levels of society. Another influence may have come from the Sōtō Zen scholar monk, Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769), whose *Rules for the Buddha's Dharma Robe* (*Shakushi hōe kun* 釋氏法衣訓, 1768) has

a section devoted to the *funzōe.* This work, which will be discussed in chapter five, retained its popularity through the Meiji period and claimed a readership outside of Sōtō Zen circles.[49] It is not clear at this point in my research whether Jiun or Menzan's works influenced the adoption of the word *funzōe* in nineteenth century exhibition catalogues, but both teachers openly discuss and elevate the *funzōe* in their writings, and in the case of Jiun, among his followers, some of whom were women of the court. The fact remains that as these ancient *kesa* moved into the public domain they began to be referred to as *funzōe*, perhaps as a way to promote the prestige of the object as closest to the form of the Buddha's own robe.

The twelve multi-color pieced *kesa* discussed in this chapter are too small a sample to reach any firm conclusions about the meaning and the form of this type of *kesa*. The traditional dating and provenance as well as the variation in construction methods of these *kesa* however, give some indication of what the multi-color pieced *kesa* may have meant in ancient Japan and suggests how this form shaped the perception of the two paradigms of the ascetic and monastic robe throughout Japanese history.

The first reliable date for the Hōryūji collection is the 747 catalogue of Hōryūji treasures, *List of [Hōryūji] Treasures*, and none of the *kesa* listed in this work clearly correspond to the two extant Hōryūji *kesa.* The *kesa* in the Shōsōin collection were under more control since Shōmu's consort had them put in the storehouse shortly after his death and access to them was quite limited. It is likely that in his first official act of bestowing the precepts on Shōmu and his court Ganjin would have given a number of *kesa* to Shōmu and others. Similarly, it is quite likely that the Enryakuji *kesa*, attributed to Zhanran and the Tōji *kesa*, attributed to Huiguo were roughly contemporaneous with the *kesa* in the Hōryūji and Shōsōin collections. It is possible that all of the twelve extant *kesa* were made from the first half of the eighth century to the ninth century.

As we saw earlier, the first state ceremonial recitation of the *Benevolent Kings*

Scripture in 660 involved Saimei distributing one hundred *nōgesa* to the monks. The introduction of the multi-color pieced *kesa* to Japan, therefore, was not as an emblem of ascetic practice but rather as a gift from the monarch to the clergy, and had a powerful association with the preservation of the sovereign and the state. The numerical prominence of the stitched, multi-color pieced *kesa* in the Shōsōin collection affirms the status of the *nōgesa* as a possession and perhaps the prerogative of the monarch. Why else would so many of this type of robe have ended up among Shōmu's possessions? The fact that only one of the nine *kesa* in this category is singled out as especially dear to Shōmu suggests that the other eight *kesa* may have been kept in reserve for bestowing on worthy clerics on ritual occasions. The potential currency of these particular *kesa* as the gift of the monarch was cut off, however, when his consort, Kōmyō, donated the *kesa* to Tōdaiji, which deposited them in the Shōsōin treasure house, taking them out of circulation.

The techniques of construction displayed in the *kesa* of the Shōsōin and Hōryūji collections appear to have originated in the geographical regions of present day Korea or China. In spite of the relatively narrow time frame of production, these *kesa* display a variety of materials and methods of construction. This suggests that the form of the multi-colored pieced *kesa* was not fixed during the eighth century. Rather, it appears to have been the focus of much experimentation: some *kesa* were constructed from patches of silk or linen and covered in fine running stitches, some were woven to look like patchwork or running stitches, and finally, the Enryakuji *kesa* which eschewed even cloth in favor of bits of silk floss sewn onto a backing. Modern Japanese scholarship on these *kesa* emphasizes the intentionality of the design, as opposed to a haphazard arrangement of cloth as we saw in Kirihata's description of the Enryakuji *kesa* or a the designation of the "far mountain" design of pieced *kesa* in the Shōsōin collection. The tapestry weave *kesa* also qualify as representational in the sense that the weaving itself depicts the bits of

cloth and even the overall running stitches of the multi-colored pieced robe.

Eighth century East Asian Buddhists seem to have distinguished the brightly colored pieced *kesa* that they were making from the rag robe. The modern tendency to see the bright colors as a degeneration of the practice of the rag robe is mistaken. As I noted in chapter one, by the time the *vinaya* was written down in the first centuries of the common era, the ascetic practice of the rag robe was already viewed as inappropriate in a monastic setting. Chinese Buddhists who studied *vinaya* texts would certainly have noticed the more common references to pieced *kesa*, and the monastic practice of using the pieces of cloth donated by the laity, regardless of size and color. The distinction shows in their traditional nomenclature, where they use variations of the term for pieced robes (*nōe, shinōe, nōgesa*), rather than the single term for rag robes (*funzōe*). Even Yuanzhao, whose interpretation of Daoxuan's teachings was highly regarded in Japan, treats the practice of the rag robe as an ancient but defunct practice. In Japan these ancient textiles were referred to as pieced robes until the late Edo period, when interest in these *kesa* as cultural treasures of the Japanese nation coincides with an increased use of the term *funzōe*.

In this context, I suggest that the multi-colored pieced *kesa* in East Asian Buddhist cultures followed the *vinaya* rule established by Śāriputra's request which allows *kesa* to be pieced from small scraps of bright cloth without re-dyeing them. While strictly speaking these *nōgesa* are monastic robes, they evoke the practice of the rag robe by colorfully representing robes made of bits of cloth. Their pictorial aspect, therefore, is part of their religious significance. The pieced robe is essentially a monastic robe that evokes the powerful religious ideal of the asceticism and dedication of the Buddha and his disciples. The *kesa* thus becomes a depiction of itself.

Although these ancient *kesa* are considered to be in a very different category from the elegant and brilliant brocade *kesa* used in later periods, it is technically a very small

step from the tapestry representations of the pieced *kesa* to the use of brocade. Before considering that step, however, I will consider the depiction of the pieced *kesa* in paintings and statues.

Part 2. Art in Japan and the Multi-color Pieced *kesa*

The artifacts discussed above yield a great deal of information about how these multi-color pieced *kesa* were made, but we need to examine art works that depict the multi-color pieced *kesa* in action in order to understand how they were worn. In this next section I discuss art works that are particularly influential in shaping the iconography of the multi-color pieced *kesa* and the different ways of wearing the *kesa*. I start with the hollow dry lacquer portrait statue of the *vinaya* master, Ganjin, from the Founders Hall of Tōshōdaiji 唐招提寺 in Nara prefecture. Although the portrait statue of Ganjin is not the earliest extant representation of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in Japan, it appears to have influenced subsequent depictions and, moreover, conveys the authority of the *Vinaya* school because of its subject. The way in which Ganjin wears this *kesa* is imitated in later artistic representations. Next, the six hollow dry lacquer statues of the Buddha's disciples from the Golden Hall 金堂 at Kōfukuji 興福寺 in Nara city display a variety of different ways of wearing the multi-color pieced *kesa* that represent the particular character and duties of each disciple.

The lacquer statue of Ganjin, created shortly after his death in 763 and the six statues of the disciples of the Buddha created in 734 are similar in the method of construction, in their manufacture by foreign craftsmen, and in the subject, namely, ordained Buddhist leaders. To represent the numerous indigenous artistic expressions of the multi-color pieced *kesa*, I have chosen two subjects: a 1201 sculpture of Hachiman Bodhisattva; and thirteenth and fourteenth century portraits of Shōtoku in the mode of filial son. The Hachiman statue, which appears to belong to a lineage of similar

depictions that date back to the ninth century, is important for the study of the multi-color pieced *kesa* because of its close resemblance to the portrait statue of Ganjin which was fairly well-known in premodern Japan. Finally, the numerous portraits of Shōtoku wearing the multi-color pieced *kesa* paired with a shawl-like garment called the *ōhi* 黄被 present several complex problems about the iconography of the subject and the meaning of this type of *kesa* in medieval Japan.

<u>The Portrait Statue of Ganjin</u>

In 742 Ganjin was already an eminent teacher in China when he was approached by two Japanese envoys, Yōei 榮叡 (fl. 740) and Fushō 普照 (fl. 740) at Daming Temple in Yangzhou. According to the account in *Journey to the East* the two envoys encouraged Ganjin to come to Japan to help fulfill Shōtoku's prediction that the teaching of Buddhism would flourish in Japan after two hundred years.[50] Ganjin replied that he had once heard that Huisi had been reborn as a prince in Japan in order to spread the Buddhist teaching, apparently indicating awareness of the legends that associate Shōtoku with Huisi, which the Tendai school regards as one of its founding teachers. Ganjin adds:

> I also heard that Nagaya Ō [Prince Nagaya] of Japan revered the Buddhadharma and made a thousand *kesa* that he sent and donated to this country's assembly of monks of great virtue. On the border of those *kesa* were embroidered a quatrain that says, "Though our mountains and rivers are a separate realms [from China and India], our wind and moon are under the same heaven. These gifts are for the disciples of the Buddha, that we may be joined together by common ties." With this thought, it truly is a country that has affinities with the flourishing of the Buddhadharma.
>
> 又聞。日本國長屋王崇敬佛法。造千袈裟棄施此國大徳衆僧。其袈裟縁上繍

著四句曰。山川異域。風月同天。寄諸佛子。共結來緣。以此思量。誠是佛法興隆有緣之國。(fasc. 1, T 51. 988b).[51]

Nagaya Ō 長屋王 (684-729), was a grandson of Tenmu, and became Minister of the left when Shōmu ascended the throne. In this position, Nagaya Ō was responsible for embassies to the East Asian mainland.[52] The poem inscribed on the thousand *kesa* suggests that the gift was as political as it was religious. This reference to the thousand *kesa* lends textual support to the notion that in the eighth century *kesa* were used as tribute between the two states. The precedent of the thousand *kesa* set by Nagaya Ō inspired Jiun one thousand years later to make one thousand *kesa* for the edification of Japanese Buddhist monks.[53]

Journey to the East states that after polling his community for volunteers and meeting with a lukewarm reception, Ganjin resolved to travel to Japan himself to establish a legitimate precept lineage and spread the teachings of the *vinaya*. After eleven years and five failed attempts, Ganjin, who had become blind during these hardships, at last reached the Japanese court in 754. He was accompanied by eighteen monks and a large entourage of craftsmen skilled in Buddhist architecture, sculpture and painting. The ship was also loaded with ritual implements of various kinds as well as *kesa*. Within a few months of his arrival he set up a provisional ordination platform at Tōdaiji and administered the precepts to Shōmu, Kōmyō and more than eighty members of the court.

Ganjin was a noted scholar of monastic rules and Tiantai thought, but the visual arts were also a key element in Ganjin's religious life. At the age of fourteen he saw a Buddha statue and was inspired to join the priesthood. His commitment to Buddhist art continued throughout his life. Records of his failed attempts to reach Japan in *Journey to the East* reveal details about Ganjin's character and inclinations. For example, on his second attempt Ganjin brought with him one hundred eighty-five craftsmen skilled in making Buddha statues and paintings. The list of ritual Buddhist implements brought on

this trip includes one thousand sets of *kesa*, under-robes (*henzan* 褊衫) and bowing mats (zagu 坐具) (Andō 1971, 53; T 51.989b). On his final, successful trip, Ganjin is recorded as having brought one thousand sewn, pieced *kesa* (*hōnō* 縫納) and two thousand cotton *kesa* (*fukesa* 布袈裟) (T 51.992a).[54] Tōshōdaiji, the temple built for him in Heijōkyō (in present day Nara), was filled with statuary he brought as well as those made by the craftsmen who accompanied him.

Ganjin had been deeply impressed when he saw the mummified body of the sixth patriarch of Chan, Huineng 慧能 (638-713), in 750 at Caoqi Nanhui temple 曹溪南華寺 in Shaozho 韶州 on his fifth attempt to reach Japan. Chan mummies and so-called mummy statues were revered as embodying the living spirit of the master (Sharf 1992, 6-10). The ideal of self-mummification in China, also known as "seated death," is derived from both Buddhist and Taoist ascetic practices and its achievement was taken as proof of the spiritual power of the subject. When attempts at self-mummification failed, the Chinese preserved the remains of eminent masters after death by covering them with cloth imbued with lacquer. This technique was first practiced on Daoxin 道信 (580-651), traditionally counted as the fourth patriarch of Chan (Brinker 1996, 89).[55] An alternative practice of mixing the ashes of the cremated master with clay to make a statue became more popular in the eighth century (Inoue 1977, 21). All three methods incorporated the bodily remains of the master with the result that the statue was both a reliquary and a true image (*shinshōzō* 真肖像) of the departed master. The concept of the true image influenced later artistic productions by valuing realistic representation over idealization (Inoue 1977, 17-18).

Near the end of Ganjin's life, his disciple Sitou 思託 (fl. 750) had a prophetic dream of his master's death and, after consulting with Ganjin, he decided to memorialize his teacher with a portrait statue. Ganjin's admiration of the mummy statue of Huineng undoubtedly influenced their plans for the portrait statue of Ganjin. The preference for

realism over idealism would apply equally to dress as well as facial features. Since Ganjin left no writings on the *kesa*, the garments depicted on this statue are a visual record of his possibly lost teachings about Buddhist vestments.

The portrait statue of Ganjin uses the hollow dry lacquer (*dakkan shitsu* 脱乾漆) technique (Akiyama 1966-1972.3, plate 54). A clay form is created and then covered with layers of lacquer imbued cloth. When the lacquer has dried, the clay form is knocked out, producing a lightweight statue impervious to insects or rot, and easily rescued in the case of fire. The lacquered cloths, in addition to producing a fine material for molding facial features, also provide an ideal surface for colored paint (Asano 1966, 180-181). The bulk of the statue is balanced by the sensitive meditative pose and the closed eyes of the statue, usually taken as an indication of Ganjin's blindness, rather than the disposition of the eyes in meditation. The multi-colored pieced *kesa* on the statue is made with dark colored strip seams that contrast with the colored field portions. The mottling of the colors in the field portion appears random, without pictorial aspect. The *kesa* is worn with the left corner flung over the left shoulder onto the back. This manner of wearing the *kesa* covers the fastening used to secure the garment onto the body, in contrast to depictions of *kesa* that prominently display a ring used as a fastener. The manner of wearing the *kesa* flung over the left shoulder as on the portrait statue of Ganjin suggests that the fastenings were simple cloth ties as described in *vinaya* regulations.[56] The lack of ornate fastenings may be an indication of Ganjin's status as an eminent *vinaya* master, but the depiction of the drapery of the *kesa* on the left side of the figure which has been tucked in all the way onto the back of the left shoulder is notable. In the Tokugawa period, Jiun used the Ganjin statue to study this particular aspect of wearing the *kesa*.

The garments worn beneath the *kesa* on the Ganjin portrait statue also indicate their special status. Izutsu (1965 76-77) notes that the statue depicts the "garment with *kesa* attached" (*kesa tsuki no rae* 袈裟付羅衣). This unusual garment, an example of

which is in the Shōsōin collection, is a sleeved top to which a rectangular *kesa*-like flap has been sewn onto the back and the right shoulder.[57] In this case, the actual *kesa* would rest on a small replica of a single-color *kesa* that had been sewn onto the sleeved Chinese style robes, preventing the *kesa from* being in direct contact with the robe beneath it. The back of the portrait statue shows a horizontal ridge about halfway from shoulder to elbow that represents the flap of this small attached *kesa*. From the front of the statue a small corner extends out from the shoulder, indicating the extension of the attached *kesa* flap in the back. The flap is the same color of the upper garment, so it is difficult to detect, and certainly does not look like a *kesa*, but its size and position resembles the extant *kesa tsuki no rae* in the Shōsōin collection.[58]

Representations of the *kesa tsuki no rae* garment can also be seen in Dunhuang cave paintings of the *Vimalakirtinirdeśa* (Izutsu 1974, 46-47, fig. 36, 1-3; and 1965, plate 52). The monk standing at the left side of the painting is wearing the garment, inferred by a flap protruding from the back of his right shoulder. Izutsu does not give the source of the illustration, but a similar painting from Cave 220 of the Mogao grottoes estimated to be from the early Tang Dynasty (618-705) shows a similar figure as that illustrated in Izutsu (Zhang 2000, 77). From this depiction in the Dunhaung caves the garment appears to have been used in portrayals of Chinese Buddhists, but not for the Buddha and his disciples, an indication that these artists understood this garment to be a variation of Buddhist vestments worn only in China.

Izutsu argues that the *kesa tsuki no rae* was worn at important ceremonies and that Ganjin would have worn this garment when he administered the precepts at Tōdaiji in 754. Certainly, the presence of the garment on the portrait statue of Ganjin supports this conclusion. If we assume that his disciples intended to portray Ganjin as a great *vinaya* master and that the statue would serve as a true testament of Ganjin's teaching for future generations, then the depiction of the garments on the portrait statue is vital. It is likely

that they would choose to depict Ganjin wearing robes that he would have used, for example, when officiating at precepts ceremonies, such as that held for Shōmu and his court. From the perspective of Ganjin and his disciples as well as later teachers like Jiun and Sawaki the portrait statue is not simply a memorial to a great man. It conveys a teaching about the multi-colored pieced *kesa* and the undergarment appropriate to it as well as how to wear these garments.

Lacquer statues of the Great Disciples of the Buddha at Kōfukuji

Another set of works by continental craftsmen in Japan that has been important for the perception of the *kesa* in Japan is the set of eighth century statues of the Buddha's disciples made for the Golden Hall at Kōfukuji. The hollow core lacquer statues of the Ten Great Disciples of the Buddha (*jūdai deshi* 十大弟子) at Kōfukuji temple are also an important source of information about the depiction of the multi-colored pieced *kesa* in the eighth century. These statues were made in 734 for the West Golden Hall as a memorial to Lady Tachibana (d. 733), the mother of Kōmyō, Shōmu's consort.[59] The works were created under the direction of the Buddhist sculptor, Shōgun Mampuku 將軍万福 (fl. 730) and the painter, Hata Ushikai 秦牛養 (fl. 730) whose names appear in the records (TKH 1997, 190).[60]

Six out of the Ten Disciples Statues are extant: Śāriputra (*Sharifutsu* 舍利弗); Maudgalyāyana (*Mokukenren* 目建連); Subhūti (*Subodai* 須菩提); Pūrṇa (*Furuna* 富楼那); Kātyāyana (*Kasen'nen* 迦旃延); and Rāhula (*Ragora* 羅　羅). All six of the disciples are wearing Chinese skirt-like undergarments and most are wearing a sleeved top under the *kesa* that covers both shoulders. Each of the *kesa* are a variation of the multi-color pieced robe.

The most clear examples of the pieced robe are on Subhuti, noted for his

comprehension of emptiness, and Rāhula, noted for his observance of monastic rules (TKH 1997, 44 and 42 respectively).[61] The field portions of the panels of both *kesa* are characterized by splotches of dark and lighter colors to signify patches of cloth, and are bounded on all sides by the dark vertical and horizontal strip seams and border, similar to the portrait statue of Ganjin. These two figures are wearing the robe over both shoulders, signifying the "field of merit" mode used when meeting the public, either on begging rounds or when lecturing.[62] The overlapping folds of a garment over Subhuti's chest suggest that he is wearing a Chinese style under-robe, and he is just placing his *kesa* in position. Rāhula is already dressed and composed for his begging rounds, his hands folded beneath the draped cloth of the *kesa* (TKH 1997, 42: plate 4).

The remaining four figures are all wearing a variation on the multi-color pieced robe. Śāriputra is wearing a "far mountain" design *kesa* with each field portion showing dark mountains appliqued onto a red ground. As the *kesa* crosses his chest its plain backing is turned to the outside. The ties are hidden underneath the flap of the out-turned *kesa*, a style that appears on the statue of Maudgalyāyana. Pūrṇa and Maudgalyāyana both wear a brocade under-robe over the right shoulder. The strip seams of Pūrṇa's *kesa* have a reddish brocade pattern. In these five figures three different styles of multi-color pieced robe are depicted: the plain random patches of Subhūti and Rāhula; the far mountain pattern of Śāriputra; and finally the brocade pieces depicted in Pūrna and Maudgalyayāna's robes.

Kātyāyana, known for his ability in exegesis of the sermons of the Buddha and for his efforts in making Buddhist doctrines understandable after the death of the other disciples, is the only figure among the six who is not wearing an undergarment beneath the *kesa* on the upper part of his body. His *kesa* is tied over the left shoulder, and it hangs low, suspended by the long ties. The *kesa* wraps around his waist over a skirt-like undergarment, leaving his right shoulder and the majority of his chest naked. In contrast

to the other disciples who are all depicted wearing the lined "great robe," suitable to interacting with the laity, Katyāyāna appears to be wearing only the five and seven panel *kesa* which, according to the *vinaya*, are worn in the compound when interacting with other monks. Even this short description of the *kesa* on each of the six statues shows that the manner of wearing the *kesa* was carefully selected to reveal some aspect of each disciple's traditional role.

These six statues of the ten disciples directly inspired modern *kesa* sewing groups to begin making multi-colored pieced robes. Sawaki Kōdō first saw them displayed at the Nara Imperial Museum (renamed the Nara National Museum in 1947) and recognized that the statues were depicted wearing pieced *kesa*, which he identified as *funzōe*. The opportunity to view these statues in the museum provided Sawaki with the inspiration to re-enact the pieced robes of the Buddhist monk.

The medium of lacquer provides enough stability so that the colors of the *kesa* depicted on these statues are still discernible, especially in the case of the Ganjin portrait statue. The colors on the portrait statue are still quite distinct. It is not clear at this point in my research to what extent the statues of the Ten Disciples would have been available in premodern times, but we do know that the statue of Ganjin was known and much revered, and that Jiun used it as one of his models for discussing features of the *kesa*. Next, I consider two figures who are not monks, but are sometimes depicted wearing multi-colored pieced robes and are revered as important religious figures in Japan: Hachiman Bodhisattva, the deity of Usa Shrine and protector of Tōdaiji, and Shōtoku, revered as a founding figure in the establishment of the Japanese state and a promoter of Buddhism.

Hachiman

A statue of Hachiman bodhisattva, tutelary deity of Tōdaiji in Nara, was commissioned by Chōgen 重源 (1121-1206) as part of the reconstruction of the temple after its destruction in 1180. In the thirteenth century the government's permission was necessary for this image to be created (Kanda 1981, 204). The form of the Hachiman statue completed in 1201 by Kaikei 快慶 (fl. 1189-1236) is traditionally called "Hachiman in clerical form" *sōgyō hachiman* 僧形八幡, a representation that dates to the early ninth century (Akiyama 1966-1972. 9, plate 7).[63] Examples of this form can be found at temples such as Jingōji 神護寺 and Tōji in Kyōto and Yakushiji 薬師寺 in Nara (Kanda 1981, 192-200).

Kanda's research indicates that the model for Kaikei's Hachiman statue was a copy of a ninth century painting that is believed to have been commissioned by Kūkai. This painting was originally installed at Jingōji, but in the late twelfth century the ownership of the painting, which had been given to the retired monarch Toba 鳥羽 (1103-1156), was hotly disputed. A secret copy of the painting kept at Ninnaji 仁和寺 was the likely model for Kaikei's sculpture since the government had declined to release the original ninth century painting to Tōdaiji.[64] Kanda argues that the strong resemblance between the Kaikei statue and extant copies of the painting puts the statue in a representational lineage that dates to the early ninth century.

The *kesa* depicted on the statue is a multi-colored pieced robe.[65] White dotted lines that represent the running stitch cover the surface of the colored field portions of the *kesa*. The field portion includes splotches of blue, reddish brown, brown, green and white on a light brown background. The shapes of the colors are irregular with ragged borders, indicating a certain degree of stylization. The depiction of how the *kesa* is worn on the Hachiman statue bears a strong resemblance to the Ganjin portrait sculpture. The left corner of the *kesa* is tucked in across the chest and onto the back the left shoulder.

The dark navy bands of the long horizontal upper border of the *kesa* cross the chest diagonally, and one vertical strip seam descends over the left side of the chest. On top of the left shoulder a slender triangle of medium green is visible, as if the inner folds of the *kesa* had been slightly turned to allow the backing to show. The details of the left shoulder treatment are strikingly similar to the portrait statue of Ganjin. As noted above, depictions of the corner of the *kesa* thrown over the left shoulder and hiding the fasteners are comparatively rare.

Later images of Hachiman also show the same way of wearing the *kesa*. There is a fourteenth century painting that matches the description of the copy of the ninth century painting that is now held by Jingōji.[66] This painting shows the splotches of color in the field portion and dark strip seams and border of the multi-colored pieced *kesa* and the manner of wearing the *kesa* described above with the long border crossing the chest diagonally, the strong vertical seam strip across the left side of the chest, the triangle of the underneath part of the *kesa* showing, and the left corner thrown over the shoulder. Similarly, a 1328 statue of Hachiman by Kōshun 康俊 (fl. 1328) of Kōfukuji, also shows the *kesa* flung over the left shoulder and the strong diagonal of the front drapery, but unfortunately, the original colors on this statue cannot be determined.[67]

The similarity of how the *kesa* is worn by these images supports Kanda's thesis that Kaikei's statue of Hachiman belongs to a particular lineage of representation. But how shall we understand this manner of wearing the *kesa*? Kanda suggests that these Kamakura period images faithfully reproduce the major features of a ninth century painting commissioned by Kūkai. What image, then, would have been the model for Kūkai's commissioned painting? Based on the depiction of the manner of wearing the *kesa*, the most obvious model is the mid-eighth century portrait statue of Ganjin whose colors would still have been quite fresh.

The resemblance between Kaikei's depiction of the *kesa* on Hachiman and the

portrait statue of Ganjin raises a number of questions. Is Hachiman being depicted as a monk who adheres to the rules of the *vinaya* and wears a robe symbolic of the early asceticism of the Buddha and his disciples? Does this lineage of portraits and statues suggest a link between Hachiman and Ganjin? Or is it that Hachiman is depicted dressed in a *kesa* befitting the tutelary deity of Tōdaiji, that is, a stitched, multi-colored pieced *kesa* like those in the Shōsōin storehouse, that were owned and perhaps worn by Shōmu? All three of these scenarios would have been meaningful for Kūkai, but without corroborating textual evidence, the strong similarities in the manner of depicting the *kesa* is the only evidence that can alert us to the possibility of an association between the portrait statue of Ganjin and Kaikei's portrayal of Hachiman.

Shōtoku and the *kesa*

Shōtoku plays an important role in the early Japanese political and religious worlds. The iconography of Shōtoku has six modes that exemplify his life as a religious and political leader: as a child of two years old reciting the name of Amida; as a young boy; as a young man of sixteen, praying and offering incense for the recovery of his ailing father; as a horseman; as a minister of the state; and finally, as a mature man of thirty five, lecturing on the *Scripture of Queen Śrimala* (Osaka bijutsu 1996, 273a).[68] Depictions of Shōtoku wearing a *kesa* are almost invariably found in illustrations of the third mode, that of the filial son praying for his father,Yōmei 用明 (r. 585-587), to return to health. The following discussion will focus on this characterization.

Legends of Prince Shōtoku (*Shōtoku taishi denryaku* 聖徳太子伝略), written in 901, records the filial son incident in Shōtoku's life. According to this account, when his father became ill in 586 during the second year of his reign, Shōtoku stayed at his father's side all night, never loosening his robes and unceasingly chanting prayers for his father's

health (Osaka bijutsu 1996, 273). The visual clues in this account are sparse, including only an explicit reference to an censer and the implied hair dressing of an immature young man. In 1317-1318, however, a revised version of the work, *Legends of Prince Shōtoku of the Bunpō Era* (*Bunpō taishi den* 文保本太子伝) describes Shōtoku wearing a *kesa* over a red under-robe in addition to carrying a gold censer. The text refers to the incident as "Nurtured by Filiality" (*kyōyō okage* 孝養御陰), a convention adopted during the Kamakura era (Osaka bijutsu 1996, 273). The additional visual elements in the fourteenth century revision were probably based on Kamakura period artistic conventions. Although the text does not mention it, Kamakura period illustrations of this incident typically show Shōtoku wearing the rectangular *ōhi* 横被 on the right side of the body.[69] The full iconography of "Nourished by Filiality" thus includes the draped headdress of the youth, an censer, the red *koromo* over which Shōtoku wears a *kesa*, and an *ōhi* (Figures 2-14 and 2-15).[70]

The *ōhi* is a rectangular garment resembling a long shawl, worn over the right side of the body. It is usually paired with a seven panel *kesa* which is worn on the left side of the body. The *ōhi* developed during the late Nara and early Heian period and was used by the Tendai and Shingon schools. Later, the Hossō 法相 and Kegon 華嚴 schools also began to use this garment (Izutsu 1974, 91-99).[71] The early history of the *ōhi* is obscure. The first example of this garment was thought to be part of the ensemble of the *kenda kokushi*, the *kesa* brought from China by Kūkai. Izutsu (1974, 96), however, argues that the garment worn with *kenda kokushi* was probably the *inse* 蔭背, a garment that was not used after the Heian period and is now known only through textual references.[72] The *ōhi* is also confused in some traditional sources with the *saṁkakṣikā* (*fuken e* 覆肩衣), a garment stipulated by the *vinaya* for nuns to cover the right shoulder and chest (fasc. 48, *Four Part Vinaya* T 22. 924c).[73] The obscurity of its origins, however, did not dampen the enthusiastic adoption and development of the *ōhi* during the

Heian and Kamakura periods.

The combination of a seven panel *kesa* paired with an *ōhi* was restricted to monks of high status. The *ōhi*, however, was worn without the *kesa* by high ranking lay people, especially when attending a series of lectures on the *Lotus Sūtra* called *Hokke hakkō* 法華八講, in which a lecture on one of eight chapters of the scripture was given each day or twice a day. The first *Hokke hakkō* was held in 791 and these meetings were commonly held at the palace and at famous temples. The practice of courtiers wearing *ōhi* to *Hokke hakkō* began in 955 under the rule of Murakami 村上 (926-967) and increased in popularity through the Kamakura period (Izutsu 1974, 98). Typically, donations of cloth were given to the participating clerics. Izutsu reports that the *Imperial Record of Eight Lectures, Shinpitsu go hakkō ki* 宸筆御八講記, a record of a *Hokke hakkō* held in 1270 to honor Retired Monarch Go-Saga 後嵯峨 (1220-1272), listed nine *ōhi* and one *nōgesa* as offerings and records the names of court officials who attended the lectures wearing *ōhi* (Izutsu 1974, 97).[74]

The *ōhi* occupies an important place in the iconography of "Nourished by Filiality" portraits of Shōtoku.[75] The presence of the *ōhi* in these paintings adds layers of meaning: the association with Lotus Sūtra lecture meetings, its exclusive use among higher ranks and finally, its ambiguous identity as both clerical and lay religious dress. Although Shōtoku wears this garment with a *kesa*, I do not think that the combination of the garments is intended to identify Shōtoku as an ordained priest. Rather, the presence of the *ōhi* in these paintings indicates Shōtoku's high social and political rank and his commitment to Buddhism as a devout layman. What is the significance, therefore, of the *kesa* that Shōtoku wears?

In the majority of these paintings Shōtoku wears a multi-color pieced *kesa* and several show the white lines of dots that are used to represent the overstitching on these garments. A few appear to represent the woven type of multi-color *kesa*. I have not yet

found any painting that faithfully depicts the two multi-color pieced *kesa* from the Hōryūji collection, perhaps an indication of restricted access to these artifacts during the ancient and medieval periods. It is likely, however, that the depiction of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in these paintings is a reference to the Tiantai patriarch, Huisi, of whom Shōtoku was believed to be an incarnation. For example, there is similarity in the depiction of the *kesa* worn by the Tendai patriarch Huisi at Ichijōji 一乗寺 in Hyōgo prefecture (Osaka bijutsu 1996, plate 165). A full analysis of the depiction of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in Shōtoku portraits will have to wait for further research. Provisionally, however, the appearance of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in paintings of Shōtoku indicates his status as a founding father of Japanese Buddhism, as well as associating him with the Buddha and his disciples and with the patriarchs of Japanese Buddhism.

Conclusion

The first chapter proposed a way of understanding the Buddhist robes in terms of three paradigms: the rag robes of the ascetic, the robes made of donated cloth of the monastic, and the robe made of golden cloth for the Buddha. Each of these paradigms addresses questions about Buddhist practice: what is the minimum physical requirement for practice; what is the relationship between the laity and monastic; and finally, what is the appropriate relationship between the Buddha and his followers? These paradigms of the robe are each bound by different but interrelated sets of rules. The robe practice described in the *vinaya* reflects different cultural milieu. The transmission of Buddhist culture from India to China and Japan radically altered the relationship between the textual descriptions of the robes and what East Asian monks wore as Buddhist vestments. These adaptations clearly affected the concept of the three robes, but it also affected the

understanding of the paradigm of the rag robe. I suggested that in China the less formally defined multi-color pieced robe was favored over the ascetic and ritually controlled practice of the rag robe described in the *vinaya*.

In this chapter I discussed the products of this cultural change in the form of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in Japan, both as a textile and in its artistic representation. The extant eighth century *kesa* textiles vary widely in production methods, showing that the form was not fixed and provided some scope for ingenuity. There are also strong indications that these *kesa*, although termed "pieced robes" (*nōe*) according to the rule for robes made out of brightly colored scraps of cloth, were understood as a representation of the rag robes of the Buddha. The shift to representation is most clear in the textiles woven to look like pieced *kesa*, but even those artifacts that were stitched together from scraps of cloth show a pictorial approach, from the simple "bark color" design to the relatively composed "far mountain" design. Artistic representations of the multi-color pieced *kesa* attempted to faithfully reproduce either the woven brocade or the colors and shapes of the pieced *kesa* as well as the running stitches that cover its surface. In short, there are *kesa* textiles that use pictorial elements, and pictures and statues that portray textile elements.

Art forms also served as an important record of ways of wearing the multi-colored pieced robes. The portrait sculpture of Ganjin, made according to the conventions of Chinese sculptures of eminent masters, portrayed the robes worn by the *vinaya* master. Thus, the multi-color pieced *kesa* portrayed in this sculpture can be taken as a reasonably accurate representation of how this kind of *kesa* was worn at that time. If this portrait statue was the model for a portrait commissioned by Kūkai that in turn served as a model for the 1201 statue of Hachiman wearing multi-color pieced *kesa*, the impact of this single Ganjin portrait statue would be considerable. In the case of the six hollow-core dry-lacquer Ten Disciples Statues at Kōfukuji, each disciple is depicted wearing *kesa* that

convey aspects of his traditional character. As a record of eighth century understanding of how the *kesa* were worn, these six statues are invaluable, not just for scholars, but also for the modern *kesa* reform movement in Japan which refers to them as authentic models.

I also discussed the political and religious significance of the extant multi-colored pieced *kesa*. The six nearly identical multi color pieced *kesa* in the Shōsōin collection suggests that these robes might have been given all at once to Shōmu by Ganjin when he arrived in Japan. As discussed in chapter one, *nōgesa* were bestowed by the monarch on clerics participating in the rituals connected with the *Benevolent Kings Scripture.* These *kesa* would have been appropriate for that purpose. The career of the Śākyamuni *kesa* at Hōryūji also shows how the extant multi-color pieced *kesa* became a locus for increasingly elaborate explanations of Shōtoku's former life as the Tendai patriarch, Huisi. By the nineteenth century the promotion of this *kesa* as a kind of contact relic of Shōtoku exploited the commercial potential of its religious significance. With increased access to the textile and its redefinition as a national treasure, the name *nōgesa* was abandoned for *funzōe*, thus collapsing the centuries old distinction maintained between the multi-color pieced robe and the rag robe.

From this history, it appears that the multi-color pieced *kesa* gradually acquired a status nearly equal to that of the golden robe of the Buddha. Made of colorful silks or linen, or woven with the latest techniques to resemble a pieced robe, it was given as a gift to a monarch, or as a transmission robe to worthy clerics such as Saichō and Kūkai. The tapestry weave multi-color *kesa* are technically quite close to tapestry woven with gold threads, referred to as *kinran* 金襴 in Japanese. The multi-color pieced *kesa* does not appear to fit with the ascetic ethos of the rag robe. Rather, the elaborate care and advanced technology involved in the woven *kesa* is reminiscent of the care with which Mahāprajāpatī made the gold thread *kesa* for the Buddha. In the story, Mahāprajāpatī is inspired to make the robe after seeing the awakened Śākyamuni. The fact that these

multi-color pieced robes are given as a gift to those who are or will become religious leaders is a significant parallel. Perhaps these colorful and finely made *kesa* better suit the ethos of the golden robe as a tribute to the Buddha's awakening and his status as a religious leader, rather than the practice of the ascetic wanderer. Their iconic power, however, lies in the ambiguity of their status as a form that lies between these two paradigms.

It was not until the modern era with the display of *kesa* in museums that these textiles could be said to have an impact on the general public. Although the Śākyamuni *kesa* of Hōryūji was shown in several public exhibits during the Tokugawa period, it was displayed folded up, not spread out. As for the Shōsōin *kesa*, I have found no record of these *kesa* being shown publicly until the modern period. The Enryakuji *kesa* appears to have been forgotten, discovered in the Kamakura period when it was inscribed, and then forgotten again until its rediscovery in 1965. The only *kesa* out of this group that was used regularly in ceremonies is Kūkai's *kenda kokushi*, but again, these ceremonies were limited to the monarch and a small group of high ranking priests and courtiers. The situation has changed, however, with the efforts of the Tokyo and Nara national museums to study, restore and display these *kesa*.

Artistic representations of these robes were relatively more accessible to the public. In his works on the *kesa* Jiun uses several art works to illustrate his study of how *kesa* are worn on the body, deducing aspects of construction such as the placement of the ties in robes by studying statues. As mentioned earlier, Jiun notes the manner of wearing the *kesa* displayed in the Ganjin portrait statue. In the twentieth century, Sawaki Kōdō was inspired by the Kōfukuji statues of the Ten Disciples of the Buddha. Understanding these statues to be wearing *funzōe*, he and his followers set out to make one themselves. The artifacts and artistic representations of the multi-color pieced robe are thus used as

models by the community of people who aspire to make and wear a robe that faithfully represents those worn by the Buddha.

1. Shōtoku, commonly referred to as "Prince Shōtoku," is traditionally regarded as the crown prince (*kō taishi* 皇太子) who lived during the reign of the female monarch, Suikō 推古 (554-628; r. 592-628). In his study of this important figure in Japanese religious history, Michael Como distinguishes the historical person, which he identifies as Prince Kamitsumiya or Umayado, from the legendary figure signified by the appellation, "Shotoku" (Como 2008, 4). In this work I am referring to this legendary figure rather than the historical person. I translate the term *tennō* as monarch, using this term for both male and female rulers.

2. In discussing the provenance of these *kesa* I am applying the standard for early Japanese sculpture established in McCallum (2001, 149-150).

3. The female monarch, Shōtoku 称徳 (764-770), awarded Hachiman a long title which was shortened to Great Bodhisattva Hachiman (*Hachiman daibosatsu* 八幡大菩薩). This name was used until the Meiji era separation of Buddhism and Shintō (*shinbutsu bunri* 神仏分離). See "hachimanjin" in Nakamura (2002, 826a).

4. The arrival of the Koguryŏ envoy in the fifth month of Saimei's sixth reign year (660) is likely to have inspired this first performance of the ritual.

5. Nakamura (2003, 805a) notes that Humane Kings assemblies (*ninnōe* 仁王會) were held beginning in the early Heian period at major temples in the capital and at the *kokubunji* in the provinces. Assemblies were also held by court society at the spring and fall solstice and at the accession ceremonies for a new monarch. The

ceremonies held in state owned provincial temples died out during the early 13th century, earlier than in the Court, which continued these ceremonies until the Ōnin War. The veneration of the *Humane Kings Sūtra* continued, however, even during nineteenth century, where we find the Tendai ascetic, Ryō a copying the sutra in his own blood (De Visser 1935, 121).

6. I am following Kiuchi (1978) and Matsumura (1998) who both identify these *kesa* by their respective legendary owners. Lyman (1984, 28-31) refers to both of the pieced robes as belonging to Shōtoku, and does not mention the traditional attribution of the *kesa* to Śākyamuni.

7. *Kesa* were often kept stored in boxes that described the contents on both the outside and the inside of the lid. It is an easy matter for a *kesa* to be switched intentionally or by accident. In chapter four I will discuss this problem in connection with the *kesa* stored at temples associated with Jiun's one thousand *kesa* sewing project. In regard to the Hōryūji *kesa*, however, the important fact for this research is that by the seventeenth century these two *kesa* were identified as the Shōtoku and Śākyamuni *kesa*, and that this traditional identification has been preserved by modern scholars.

8. Kiuchi attempts to describe the dimensions of the *kesa*, stating that it is much smaller than most *kesa* found in the Shōsōin collection. He does not speculate why this would be. Most scholars, however, accept as a standard the dimensions given in TKH (1975, 304). The Hōryūji collection identification number for the Shōtoku *kesa* is #34. A color plate of the reconstructed *kesa* and a close-up of a portion of the *kesa* showing the stitching detail appears in Sawada (2001.2, 27; plate III-ii-17).

9. The terms "vertical" and "horizontal" correspond to current Japanese *kesa* terminology. See Kyūma (1967, 88).

10. Matsumura (1998, 30) cites a conversation with the textile historian, Sawada Mutsuyo. I have not been able to find a written account of this point in Sawada's own writings.

11. For example, Lyman states that the *kesa* is sewn with overlapping seams, but the descriptions in Matsumura (1998) and Kiuchi (1978) are more ambiguous. On the other hand, the Tokugawa period scholar monk Jiun describes a linen pieced *kesa* sewn with overlapping seams that was purported to belong to Shōtoku. Jiun's report will be discussed in more depth in chapter four.

12. Sawada (2001) studied Buddhist banners found in the Shōsōin and Hōryūji collections. By comparing the reliably dated construction characteristics of continental banners with the banners found in the Japanese collections he distinguished sixth and seventh century banners from those made in the eighth century and later. No comparable study has been done with the *kesa* collections.

13. See TKH (1975, 304) for a written description and a black and white photo, plate no. 399. The Hōryūji collection identification number is #33. A color plate of the reconstructed *kesa* and a close-up of a portion of the *kesa* showing the stitching detail is published in Sawada (2001.2, 27; plate III-ii-16).

14. The term *moroyori ito* 諸撚糸 is defined as a thread made from two strands of thread that have been twisted from opposite directions. For an illustration of the *moriyori* type of thread twist see Owari Textile Research Center (*Owari sen'i kenkyū senta* 尾張繊維研究センター), "*yori-ito* 撚糸". (Available online as of

2-3-10 at: http://tech.owaritex.jp/twist/twist_kind.htm). Matsumura's account, based on conversations with the textile preservationist, Sawada, differs from that of Kiuchi (1978, 8) who states that it is a simple double thread.

15. For an online demonstration of this basic sewing technique see "Collection of Illustrated Subject Matter for Educational Use" *kyōiku gazō sakusai shū* 教育画像素材集, "*gushinui* ぐし縫い" (Avalable online as of 7-14-08 at http://www2.edu.ipa.go.jp/gz/d1home/d1sew/d1stit/IPA-hom180.htm.

16. Okamoto was the head nun of Jōshukuji 常宿寺 in Ichinomiya 一宮 city where I did much of my fieldwork from 2002-2006. Okamoto studied with Kawase Genkō 川瀬玄光 (1908-1988) at the Nagoya Study Center for Nuns (see chapter five below). Okamoto is now retired and *kesa* sewing retreats are no longer held at Jōshukuji.

17. For more information on the documents related to Hōryūji discussed in this chapter see *Hōryūji shōwa shizaichō* (1983-1985, vols. 1 and 15).

18. The text designates the sizes of the *kesa* as "Buddha sized" or "human sized" defined as sixteen and eight *shaku*, respectively. A *shaku* is approximately one English foot measure.

19. Izutsu (1965, 76) does not attempt to reconcile this list of eleven with the two extant pieced *kesa* in the Hōryūji collection. Kiuchi (1978, 4) cites this text as evidence of the existence of the extant Shōtoku *kesa*, although he does not directly cite the passage or identify which of the eleven listed *kesa* it might be.

20. For more details about Kenshin's life, see Ogino (1980, 15-21).

21. Text in parentheses are comments from the compiler of the text, printed in small

type. Words inside brackets are my additions.

22. The six iconic stances of Shōtoku will be discussed in the following section on representation of the multi-color pieced *kesa* in art.

23. Hereafter, I refer to Jianzhen by his Japanese name, Ganjin, to avoid confusion in discussing his portrait statue later in this chapter. Ōmi no Mifune's biography is a Japanese adaptation of a comprehensive biography written by Ganjin's student, Situo 思託 (fl. 750). Since only fragments of Situo's work remain, Ōmi's adaptation is commonly used for information about Ganjin's life.

24. On the subject of the *kesa* as a contact relic of the Buddha, see Strong (2004, 216-221).

25. Lyman aptly illustrates this point with a photograph of sycamore tree bark (Lyman 1984, 37: fig. 16)

26. Photographic reproductions of the three *kesa* are in Shōsōin jimusho, ed. (1960-1964.3, plates 17, 18 and 19). See also Matsumura (1998, 32-34).

27. For a definition of *kesi* see Zhang (2000, 337). For a graphic illustration of the folded back threads of the *kesi* technique see Asianart.com, "Kesi silks," available online as of July 24, 2008 at: http://www.asianart.com/kesi/about.html.

28. "Weft-faced tapestry" translates the Japanese word, *nukinishiki* 緯錦, which is used to describe the weaving technique in this textile (Izutsu 1965, 69; n. 39, 40). This tapestry technique corresponds to the weaving technique called *kesi* 緯糸 in Chinese.

29. Modern scholarship on the Dunhuang caves began in 1900. There are 492 caves

with frescoes and statues dating to the seventh century. For an example of the far mountain design of a *kesa* depicted in a mural, see the portrayal of The Magic Competition in cave 196, dated 893-894, illustrated in Fraser (2004): plate 26.

30. For examples of depictions of multi-color pieced *kesa* with the far mountain design also see Zhang (2000, 96-97; plate 43).

31. Photographs of this *kesa* with the truest color reproduction are in KKH (2005, 66-67; plates 33, 34).

32. The open seam method is more commonly used in the cut-and-sewn method. The technique as described in the *vinaya* leaves unsewn gaps at intervals along the folded edge of the overlapping seams without endangering the integrity of the garment (fasc. 40, *Four Part Vinaya*, T 22.855b).

33. Saichō did not list the *kesa* in his *List of Imports* (*Dengyō Daishi shōrai chōshū roku* 傳教大師將來越州録), so there is room for doubt about the actual provenance of this *kesa*.

34. This issue is a topic for further research. I will discuss similar cases in chapter five below in the context of Dōgen and the transmission *kesa*.

35. The *Tendai kahyō* is published in DNB 125 and 126.

36. Sawa (1969, plates 209 and 210) shows photos of this robe.

37. For a close-up photograph of these "stitches" on the *kesa* see Izutsu (1965, plate 57). Izutsu also provides a schematic diagram of the weaving technique in plate 58.

38. In modern usage, *kanthā* also refers to the running stitch used to outline shapes in

embroidery found on Indian *sari.* This *kanthā* stitch resembles the form and uses of the running stitch (*sashiko* 刺し子) in Japanese sewing. I am using the older meaning of *kanthā* in this work, that is, "clothing made from scraps."

39. Gōhō, citing Daoxuan's *Buddhist Vestments* and *Practice and Service Comments*, argues that *kenda* is the color *mokuran*. He then adds that some people mistakenly believe the word means Gandhara, which, combined with the word *kokushi*, refers to a type of silk gauze cloth from India. Gōhō's explanation of the name shows that even in the Kamakura period its meaning was a matter of debate.

40. Rambelli's description of the *kenda kokushi* follows the *Tōbōki* explanation described above. In this section, Rambelli discusses how the aspersion of the clothes of the monarch is done in place of the direct aspersion of the monarch's body, an aspect of the ceremony that was discontinued in the Meiji period. It is unclear whether the *kenda kokushi* is part of the aspersion process or not, but he makes it clear that clothing as a substitute for the body is an important aspect of how the ceremony is practiced today.

41. For more information on the relationship between Hōryūji's premodern public displays of its treasures and their transfer to the national government in the Meiji period see McDermott (2006); Kornicki (1994); and TKH (1996).

42. Kornicki (1994, 167-196) identifies four patterns of premodern display that contributed to the development of museums in Japan. He notes that the practice of temples displaying images and other religious objects that were usually kept hidden began as early as the Heian period. Also see Kentarō (1997, 719-733).

43. Higuchi (1979, 29a) places the exhibition at Zōjōji, citing the *Diary of Ryūkō*

(*Ryūkō sōshō nikki* 隆光僧日記). Ryūkō 隆光 (1659-1724) states that the exhibit was held in the Prince Shōtoku Hall (*Taishi dō* 太子堂) behind the Main Ceremonial Hall (*hondō* 本堂). Kiuchi and Sawada (1978) agree with this account. But TKH (1996), basing its account on *Record of Travelling Exhibitions in Edō* (*Edō kaichō no ki* 江戸開帳の記), states that the exhibit was held at Ekō-in. I am relying on this public record of the exhibit rather than the account in Ryūkō's private diary.

44. A three volume illustrated catalogue showing this core group of items plus an additional fifteen items was prepared for an exhibition in Kyoto in 1795 at Hōrinji 法林寺. This catalogue was used as a model for the 1843 exhibition catalogue (THK 1996, 10).

45. The use of parentheses follows the original text.

46. For more information about the publication history of the *Shōbōgenzō* see Bodiford (1993, 45-50).

47. The title of this work is *Record of the Verification of Prince Shōtoku's Kesa* (*Shōtoku Taishi kesa kenchō ki* 聖徳太子袈裟験證記; JSZ 1.329-340).

48. The subject of Jiun's one thousand robe project will be discussed in chapter four.

49. The woodblock print copy of Menzan's *Guidelines for Dharma Robes of Buddhist Monks* currently published by Baiyō in Kyoto includes a postscript to the effect that the woodblocks were cut at the request of a follower of Jiun Onkō. This note does not appear in the official collected editions of the Sōtō School. Premodern extant editions from the original printing of 1768 are at Kōdai University; and an 1848 edition is at Otani University in Kyoto. A 1912 edition is at Ryūkoku

University in Kyoto and at Komazawa University in Tokyo.

50. The following remarks concerning Shōtoku's prediction that are attributed to Ganjin could therefore be an embellishment by Ōmi no Mifune.

51. Jiun's interpretation of this passage is that Nagoya-Ō had one thousand *kesa* made and sent them to the monks of China. The conviction that Nagaya-Ō's gift to Chinese monks influenced Ganjin's decision to come to Japan was an important factor in Jiun's decision to replicate the making of one thousand robes (see chapter four below). Modern Japanese scholars also take the view that Nagaya-Ō sent the *kesa* to China (Hase 2004; Andō 1971). For an alternate view of this passage see William Bodiford's translation in Lopez, ed. (2004, 306-317).

52. Recent archeological investigations at the site of Nagaya-Ō's residence in Nara has revealed wooden tablets that were used to record transactions. See Joan Piggot's (1990) study. Nagaya-Ō was opposed to the rise of the powerful Fujiwara and was forced to commit suicide in 729.

53. See accompanying book for the 200 year memorial for Jiun, published by the memorial organizers, Jiun Sonja nihyaku kai onki no kai (2004, 65). This will be discussed in chapter four.

54. The distinction between these two types of *kesa* is not yet clear to me.

55. Sharf (1992, 13-15; 20-21) discusses the process of mummification in more detail, as well as the relationship between mummies and funerary portraits of eminent Buddhist masters.

56. The rule for using fastenings on Buddhist garments is found in fascicle 26 of the *Five Part Vinaya* (T 22.174c). The subject of cloth ties versus a combination of

metal fastenings and braided cords or ties is a complex topic which I discuss in chapter five below. See also chapter four below for Jiun's interpretation of the *kesa* worn by the portrait statue of Ganjin.

57. See Shōsōin (2002, 28-29) which describes the garment as "gauze robe dyed reddish brown (*mokuran*) with attached *kesa* (*kesa tsuki mokuran zome no ra no koromo* 袈裟付木蘭染羅衣). Two extant garments are kept at the Southern Storehouse of the Shōsō-in. For a description and a model of how the garment would have been worn, see the Izutsu costume museum website, which shows a manikin wearing a multi-color pieced *kesa* over the *kesa tsuki no rae*, available as of 4-23-08: http://www.iz2.or.jp/fukushoku/f_disp.php?page_no=0000021

58. It is unclear what the functional relationship would be between this garment and the shawl (*ōhi* 横被). This example shows that the form is quite different in both the actual garments and their depiction. Izutsu (1965, 77) explains that unlike the *ōhi*, the practice of the *kesa tsuki no rae* does not seem to have been adopted as a Japanese tradition, appearing only in the ceremonial garments used in the annual Tōdaiji water ceremony (*omizutori* 御水取り).

59. Photographs of these statues are reproduced in a number of publications. I am using color reproductions are in TKH (1997, 40-49; plate 4). Perhaps the best reproductions are in Nara Rokudaiji taikan kankōkai, ed. (1999-2001, plates --). Sugiyama (1967, 68; 70-72) has one color plate and several black and white photos.

60. Sugiyama argues that the procedures involved in making lacquer statues were not well known and that the newness of the medium and its use in Tang China appealed to Shōmu and Kōmyō who commissioned the statues (1967, 57). He

also speculates that the statues were probably made by craftsmen newly immigrated from Korea who would be more experienced with this technique and he argues that the sensitive and realistic treatment of the facial expressions, especially the manner in which the age of the subjects is depicted indicates the work of craftsmen from the Korean peninsula.

61. I was unable to reproduce the clarity of the TKH (1997) photographs of these statues, so I refer the reader to this work. Figure 12 below shows the statue of Rāhula as a sample.

62. This manner of wearing the *kesa* will be discussed in detail in chapter four in the discussion of Jiun.

63. For details about Hachiman's relationship to Tōdaiji and on the general topic of the depiction of native deities (*kami*), see Kanda (1985).

64. Kanda (1981, 206) explains that although the Ninnaji copy is no longer extant, a fourteenth century painting now held at Jingōji matches a description of the original copy in a thirteenth century diary.

65. Kanda (1981, 201) merely comments that the depiction of the *kesa* is "accurate," so the following description is based on my own observations.

66. A good black and white photograph of the painting that shows the lines of running stitch is in Kageyama (1973, plate 100). Also see Kanda (1985): plate 54.

67. For two views of Kōshun's statue of Hachiman see Kanda (1985, plates 55 and 56). The figure is owned by the Boston Museum of Fine Arts (accession number 36,413) and can be seen at their website (accessed as of 2-3-10: http://www.mfa.org).

68. Osaka bijutsu (1996) cites Ishida's (1976) analysis of one thousand artistic representations of Shōtoku.

69. I will refer to this garment by its Japanese name.

70. There are a number of Kamakura era portraits of Shōtoku in the "Nourished by Filiality" mode that are reproduced in Osaka bijutsu (1996). Plate 170 of this volume shows the red figured *ōhi* prominently displayed from the right shoulder across the chest. In this portrait Shōtoku wears a multi-color pieced *kesa* with dark strip seams.

71. The *ōhi* was not used by schools that developed during the late Heian and Kamakura period such as the Zen and the Jōdo schools, nor does it appear among the garments of various *vinaya* lineages (Izutsu 1974, 95).

72. Izutsu (1974, 91-92) shows that references to the *inse* appear in texts through the tenth century, citing the previously discussed list of eleven *kesa* in the 747 text, *List of [Hōryūji] Treasures*, the ninth century *Collections of Three Eras* (*Ruiju sandai kaku* 類聚三代格) and the 905-967 *Regulations of the Engi Era* (*Engi shiki* 延喜式). Izutsu discounts the speculation by Ōga (1944) that the *kenda kokushi* was originally a nine panel *kesa* that was rebuilt into a seven panel *kesa* with an attached *ōhi*. I have not yet been able to obtain a copy of Oga's work.

73. Izutsu (1974, 99) notes that this confusion appears in fascicle five of one of the earliest Japanese encyclopedias, *Wamyō ruijū shō* 倭名類聚抄, written in 931-937 by Minamoto Shitagō 源順 (911-983). The complex issue of the origin of this garment and its place in Buddhist vestments awaits future research.

74. I am relying on Izutsu's knowledge of these texts which I have not yet investigated.

75. For more information on the different ways in which the *ōhi* and *kesa* are depicted in portraits of Shōtoku, see Osaka shiritsu bijutsukan (1996). This volume has numerous portraits and helpful articles about this iconography.

Chapter Three

The Merit of the Robe as Depicted in Medieval Literature

Introduction

In the previous chapter I examined how extant eighth century *kesa* textiles established the physical parameters for the highly revered *nōe*, or pieced *kesa*. The brightly colored patches or woven patterns of the *nōe* corresponded to the five-pieced robe described in *vinaya* texts as monastic robes, distinct from the rag robe. These multi-color pieced robes were specified in rituals involving the protection of the state as early as the seventh century. The multi-color pieced robe also appears to have been given as tribute to and from Japanese monarchs as well as being worn by them as a sign of their religious and secular leadership.

The next two chapters take up the question of how texts shaped the Japanese Buddhist understanding of the *kesa*. First, there are texts that establish and support beliefs about the power or merit of the *kesa* and second, there are texts that address the meaning of the form of the *kesa* and practices associated with it. These two categories are not mutually exclusive but in general, texts that deal with the merit of the *kesa* are little concerned with form. Rather, they became part of the discourse about the age of the degeneration of the dharma (*mappō* 末法) and were particularly prevalent during the Kamakura period. The ideas expressed in these texts were derived from Buddhist canonical texts as well as indigenous sources and formed a basis for popular beliefs. In contrast, texts that focus on the form and the practice of the *kesa* flourished under policies created by the Tokugawa government that included orders to Buddhist schools to clarify the tenets and practices of their schools. Although not absent in earlier periods, texts that dealt with the form and practice of the Buddhist robe multiplied during the Tokugawa period and were primarily aimed at a clerical audience. Both types of literature were

essential for the formation of modern *kesa* sewing groups that depended on a diffuse Japanese cultural reverence for the *kesa* as well as a need to define the proper form and practice of the "robe according to the *dharma*." This chapter focuses on beliefs regarding the *kesa* that developed out of a variety of Buddhist literary genre from the late Heian through the Kamakura period, approximately the eleventh through the thirteenth centuries. The following chapter discusses the burgeoning of texts about the Buddhist robe during the Tokugawa period and the efforts to reform the physical form and the religious practice of the robe.

An interest in notions of the merit of the *kesa* that emerged during the late Heian period were derived from Buddhist canonical texts as well as indigenous Chinese and Japanese writings. In part one I discuss the influence of a Chinese encyclopedia, *Forest of Pearls in the Garden of the Dharma* (*Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠琳, T 53 no. 2122; described below) as a model of cultural adaptation in Japan. This is followed by an analysis of stories about the *kesa* in Japanese tale literature where the belief that the *kesa* itself had the power to deflect physical harm from the wearer combined easily with local folklore. In these stories the *kesa* was also viewed with some ambivalence as a garment of disguise when the wearer's actions are not necessarily in accord with the spiritual qualities evoked by the *kesa*. Japanese Buddhists favored this kind of story, especially those that suggested that the power of the *kesa* triumphed even over deception by establishing a karmic connection unknown to the wearer that would result in the person's eventual awakening.

This view of the *kesa* as a true sign of Buddhism regardless of the circumstances or actions of the wearer reaches its fullest elaboration in the notion of a person who adopts the appearance of a monk without receiving the precepts. Section three discusses the influence of a compilation, *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* (*Mappō Tōmyōki* 末法燈

明記; described below), that redefined the role of the monk during *mappō.* According to this text, monks should be referred to as a monk in name only, also translated as "nominal monk," arguing that the shaved head and the *kesa* alone carried the sign of the Buddhist monk during these difficult times. Other texts, such as the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* (*Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka sūtra*; *Hikekyō* 悲華經T 3 no. 157) discussed in part four, described a salvific role for the *kesa* in an impure world based on vows taken by Śākyamuni Buddha in a former life.[1]

Part 1. *Forest of Pearls in the Garden of the Dharma*: a model for adapting beliefs about *kesa*

During the late Heian and Kamakura periods ideas about the spiritual merit of the *kesa* were developed in encyclopedic Buddhist works, collections of short tales, and the writings of prominent Buddhist teachers. Perhaps the most influential of these was the Chinese encyclopedic text, *Forest of Pearls in the Garden of the Dharma* (henceforth *Garden of the Dharma*), that was used as a scriptural reference as early as the Nara period. In content and rhetorical form, *Garden of the Dharma* provides literary tools vital to the process of acculturation of Buddhist teachings. The *Garden of the Dharma* influenced Japanese Buddhist literary forms such as sermons and collections of Buddhist tales.[2] Collections of Buddhist and secular tales, heavily influenced by *Garden of the Dharma*, were a crucial step in this process of establishing the notion of Japan as a Buddha land.

Garden of the Dharma was completed in 668 by Daoshi 道世 (?-683) who was a colleague of the Chinese *vinaya* master, Daoxuan, and a member of the translation team directed by Tripiṭaka Master Xuanzang 玄奘三藏 (602-664). The *Garden of the Dharma* is organized topically, citing scriptural passages as well as indigenous Chinese tales on

sixty-eight topics in one hundred fascicles. Each topic is further subdivided into sections with scriptural citations illustrating the points, followed by a section containing relevant miracle tales of India and China. The purpose of the miracle tales is to demonstrate the validity of Buddhist teachings in a new cultural context. Although the structure of *Garden of the Dharma* resembles an encyclopedia, it does not attempt to give a full description of the robes. Rather, it selects those materials that discuss the merit of the *kesa*. It was not only a resource for scriptural and Chinese indigenous materials; the rhetorical structures of *Garden of the Dharma* also provided a model for Japanese writers who sought to appropriate Buddhist teachings into their own cultural sphere.

The section on Buddhist robes cites passages that emphasize the merit of the *kesa* under the following six topics: definition of the robe (*jutsui* 述意), the effective function of the Buddhist robe (*kōnō* 功能), names of the robe (*ena* 會名), deliverance from difficulties (*sainan* 濟難), awesome responsivenes of the robe (*ihō* 威報), and finally, distance and diminishment (*enson* 遠損), that is, the power of the robe to help those who are estranged from the teaching, as in the age of the degeneration of the dharma (T 53.556a-563b). This last section is the longest, occupying nearly five out of the total of seven pages on the robe, and it includes miracle tales of the robe in India as well as a description of Daoxuan's apocalyptic vision of the Buddhist robe.[3]

The manner of citation in *Garden of the Dharma* varies from a brief excerpt that asserts the merit of the robe to lengthy quotes with minimal editing. For example, the citation from the *Flower Adornment Scripture* (*Kegon kyō* 華嚴經) simply states that the robe removes the wearer from the three poisons of greed, hate and delusion (T 53.556b). Longer quotations from scripture include both plain narratives and more rhetorically complex passages that both assert and narrate.

The plain narrative style is illustrated by the two citations under the topic

"deliverance from difficulties." First, a citation from fascicle two of the *Mahāsāṃghika-vinaya* describes the previous life of the protagonist, Dhaniya, as a dragon. Pursued by an enormous magical bird called the Garuda, the dragon placed a *kesa* on his head and escaped from his attacker (T 53.557b; T 22.240a-b).[4] Similarly, the citation from the fourth fascicle of the *Scripture of Buddha's Teaching of the Ocean Dragon King* (*Fu shou Hai long wang jing* 佛説海龍王經, T 15. no. 598) describes the difficulties encountered by an entire dragon kingdom in eluding Garuda birds who had been carrying off their children to eat. The Buddha, taking pity on them, offered a portion of his black robe for protection. Hidden under the cloth, the dragon children escaped attacks by the birds (T 53.557b-c; T 15.151a). The narrative goes on to describe how the dragon community paid respect to the robe as they would to the Buddha or a stūpa, and includes the Buddha's promise that if they continued to revere the robe, they would be freed from their dragon bodies in their next rebirth.[5] The two stories in this section demonstrate the power of the *kesa* through a simple narrative that creates a world view and a ritual context to support the belief.

In the more complex rhetorical pattern the Buddha is the protagonist who uses a story or prediction to explain why the robe worn by his monks has merit. An example of this type is the citation from the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* in the second section entitled "function and efficacy." Śākyamuni Buddha relates that in a previous life, under the guidance of Ratnagarbha Buddha, he took five hundred vows concerning the land in which he would realize Buddhahood and teach others (T 53.556b-c; T 3.220a-b). The final five vows predict the five kinds of merit that the robe will have in his Buddha land. *Garden of the Dharma* cites the passage regarding the five vows without abbreviation, occupying the majority of this section. In this combination type, the Buddha's vows are themselves the assertion, framed within the narrative of the circumstances under which he makes the vow.

The rhetorical forms used in *Garden of the Dharma* emphasize narrative, both in the choice of content as well as the space allocated. Daoshi uses the complex narrative form described above to relate Daoxuan's dream, which occupies nearly half of the section on robes.[6] This narrative is framed as a vision granted to Daoxuan by the gods in which the Buddha tells the history of his own great robe or *saṅghātī*, and makes a prediction about what will happen in a future time when the dharma is under attack by an evil king. The vision explains that because the robe bestowed on Śākyamuni Buddha by the gods is not merely his personal robe but is the relic of Kāśyapa Buddha, it had to be enshrined in its own stūpa throughout Śākyamuni's lifetime. It was to be taken out only when he was going to preach. The vision thus makes strong associations between the robe and the relics of the Buddha's body. This *kesa* along with other great *kesa* of monks who died for the Mahāyāna are enshrined in the reliquary. When Buddhism is threatened, these *saṅghātī* along with the ordination platform, can reproduce the Buddha's teaching. The combination of history and prediction in Daoxuan's dream shifts the geographic focus from India to Chinese and tells a Chinese tale of the protection of the dharma in times of adversity in China. The apocalyptic vision brings the Buddha's teaching close at hand to demonstrate in the words of the Buddha himself that China is a Buddha land.

In spite of the prominence of this vision narrative in the section on robes in *Garden of the Dharma*, I have found little textual evidence that the content of Daoxuan's dream had a direct impact on Japanese Buddhist understanding of the *kesa*. There is some evidence, however, that the beliefs surrounding the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* during the Kamakura period produced an association between the robe and bodily relics of the Buddha. I will discuss the influence of this scripture in section four below. There is clear evidence, however, that Japanese Buddhists mined the scriptural citations in the beginning of the section on robes in *Garden of the Dharma*, and that the use of narrative and the appropriation of Indian and Chinese stories influenced Japanese tale literature.

tale literature. *Garden of the Dharma* thus acted as a source of useful quotations on particular topics while providing a rhetorical model for stories that demonstrate the power of Buddhism in a new land.

Part 2. Tale literature

The genre of tale literature began in the early ninth century. Modern studies refer to tale literature in Japanese as *setsuwa bungaku* 説話文学, a term that was invented to provide a Japanese equivalent for the Western terms like folk-tale and fairy tale that would be distinct from the Japanese terms that referred to legend (*densetsu* 伝説) and myth (*shinwa* 神話). *Setsuwa bungaku* has come to encompass a wider range of literature, including stories from Chinese histories and Buddhist literature. Tale literature, even when depicting marvelous or magical events, conveys a sense of immediacy and closeness to ordinary life (Mills 1970, 2-3).

Miraculous Tales of Japan (*Nihon Ryōiki* 日本霊異記) was compiled in 822 by Kyōkai 景戒 (or Keikai, fl. 820), a priest at Yakushiji, to illustrate the reward of good actions and the punishment of bad actions.[7] Kyōkai, ordained late in life, spent many of his early years working around the temple and was in contact with ordinary people from whom he heard a number of old stories that had been orally transmitted for generations. *Miraculous Tales of Japan* is therefore highly prized as a repository of early Japanese Buddhist oral literature. The fact that Kyōkai's work was modeled on Chinese tale literature and written in Chinese suggests that his intended audience was male, literate and probably clerical, and that the work was meant as a resource for composing sermons.[8] Tale literature thus originated in a close relationship with Buddhism, compiled by priests for priests in order to illustrate the working of Buddhist truths in

Japan, but it drew on orally transmitted stories that circulated among all classes of people.[9]

Since Chinese was almost exclusively used by males, *Miraculous Tales of Japan* and other examples of early tale literature had a restricted audience even if the content of the stories were recycled in sermons. In the late Heian period this situation changed with the development of a new form of writing that mixed Chinese words and phrases with Japanese word order and grammatical endings (i.e., so-called *wakan konkōbun* 和漢混淆文). This mixed style allowed the writer to incorporate the vernacular while still using the terminology of Chinese histories and Buddhist scriptures. I discuss selections from two collections in this style: *Collected Tales of Times Now Past* (*Konjaku monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集; hereafter *Times Now Past*); and *Collection of Sand and Pebbles* (*Shasekishū* 沙石集; hereafter *Sand and Pebbles*), compiled by Mujū Ichien 無住一円 (1227-1312). The different approaches to the depiction of the *kesa* in these two collections show how Buddhist ideas were being assimilated and presented to new audiences through tale literature.

Times Now Past is one of the earliest examples of tales literature in the mixed style and its collection of over one thousand tales became a resource for later tale collections. The date of composition and identity of the compiler of *Times Now Past* is not clearly known, but scholars generally agree that it was written at the end of the Heian period, in the first half of the twelfth century.[10] The tales in the collection come from both oral tradition and literary sources, including Buddhist scripture, Chinese histories, and secular Japanese works. The thirty-one books comprising *Times Now Past* are evenly divided between Buddhist and secular themes and are classified according to the geographical advance of Buddhism eastward from India: five books for India; five for China (one is not extant); and twenty-one for Japan (two are not extant) (Miner 1985, 188-189).

The idea that the *kesa* could be used both as a disguise and for unintended purposes is expressed in the first tale in *Times Now Past* which tells the story of Prince Siddhārtha leaving home and beginning his spiritual search. In this story, the first robe obtained by the prince is through an exchange with a hunter who is a manifestation of the gods. The story of an exchange of robes with a hunter appears in various forms from the earliest sources of Buddhist literature, and includes the following stock elements: an expression of dismay from the prince at the inappropriateness of his palace garments for his new life, the transformation of the god into the form of a hunter carrying a bow, a description of the prince's palace robes made of fine cloth studded with jewels, the proposal of an exchange of garments initiated by the prince, and the return of the god to the pure realm, carrying the prince's former robes.[11] Variations of the story occur mostly in the physical description of the hunter's robes, and in the verbal exchanges between the hunter and the prince.

Different versions of the story describe the hunter's robe as: a robe dyed the color of *kaṣāya*; a *kaṣāya*; and a robe made from deerskin. The first two descriptions highlight the ambiguity created when the color term *kaṣāya* is used as a general term for the monk's set of three robes. Some versions of the story indicate that the color *kaṣāya,* which refers to a mixed reddish-ochre color, is suitable clothing for those who make their living in the forest.[12] A garment described as the color of *kaṣāya* could therefore refer either to the garments of the hunter, or to the robes worn by Buddhist monks. As a name for the robe, however, *kaṣāya* (hereafter, *kesa*) refers only to the garments of the Buddhist monk, a usage characteristic of East Asian Buddhism. The ambiguity is whether the hunter is wearing garments dyed a reddish color appropriate to forest dwelling hunters, or whether he is wearing a renunciate's *kesa,* a garment inappropriate for one whose profession involves killing.

Verbal exchanges between the hunter and the young prince reveal how each

version of the story deals with the ambiguity of the term *kaṣāya*. When the garments are described as ochre-colored hunter's robes, the emphasis is on the prince wanting to exchange his inappropriately fine robes for simple garments suitable for forest living, as though he were adopting the dress of his new environment. When the garment is referred to simply as a *kesa*, the exchange hinges on the inappropriateness of a hunter wearing the robe of the Buddha. It is the emphasis on inappropriateness that is brought out in the *Times Now Past* version of the story:

> At that point one of the beings of the pure heavens appeared before the Prince in the form of a hunter wearing a *kesa*. Seeing this, the Prince was joyful and declared, "You are wearing the robe of tranquility and purity, the *kesa* of all the Buddhas of the ancient past. Aren't you making an error in wearing it?" The hunter replied, I wear the *kesa* to lead on the deer. When the deer see the *kesa* they all come near me and I kill them." The Prince said, "You wear the *kesa* in order to kill deer; you are not wearing the *kesa* in order to seek liberation. I will give you this robe of seven jewels and will put on the *kesa* you are wearing to seek the liberation of all beings." The hunter replied, "marvelous," and exchanged the prince's robe with the *kesa*. The prince took the hunter's *kesa* and put it on. At that moment the being of the pure heaven resumed his original form and rose to the sky in the midst of a brilliant light.
>
> 其時ニ淨居天、太子ノ御前ニシ猟師ト成テ袈裟ヲ着タリ。太子、此ヲ見テ、喜テ宣ハク「汝ガ着タル衣ハ寂淨ノ衣也、往昔ノ諸佛ノ袈裟也。何ゾ此ヲ乍着ヲ罪ヲ造ル」ト。猟師ノ云ク、「我レ袈裟ヲ着テ諸ノ鹿ヲ誘ナフ。鹿、袈裟ヲ見テ来テ、皆、我ニ近付ク。我レ、其ヲ殺也」ト。太子ノ宣ハク、「汝ガ袈裟ヲ着ハ鹿ヲ殺ガ為也、解脱ヲ求テ着タルニ非ズ。我レ此ノ七宝ノ衣ヲ汝ニ与テ、汝ガ着タル袈裟ヲ我レ着テ一切衆生ヲ救ハム」ト。猟師、

「善哉」ト云テ太子ノ衣ニ袈裟ヲ替ツ。太子ハ猟師ノ袈裟ヲ取テ着給ツ。其時ニ浄居天、本ノ形ニ成テ虚空ニ昇りヌレバ空中ニ光明アリ。(Yamada 1959 22.64-65).[13]

Times Now Past does not portray the Prince as concerned about wearing his costly garments as he becomes a renunciate. He is focused instead on the contradiction of a hunter wearing a *kesa*. When the hunter appears before him he instantly recognizes the hunter's robe as the *kesa* of the Buddhas of the past. This recognition erases any ambiguity about the garment that the hunter wears: it is not a garment dyed the color of *kesa*; it is a *kesa*. The Prince immediately challenges the hunter, shifting the emphasis to the inappropriate use of the *kesa* to disguise an intent to kill. The Prince then begins to negotiate for the robe, arguing that he will wear it in order to seek liberation for all beings. That is, the exchange should be made on the basis of returning the *kesa* to its proper function. How does the depiction of the story in *Times Now Past* differ from its scriptural sources?

Yamada (1959-1961, 61) cites the second fascicle of the *Scripture of Cause and Effect in the Past and Present* (*Guoqu xianzai yinguo xing* 過去現在因果經, T 3.634a; hereafter *Cause and Effect*) as the source of the *Times Now Past* story, and cites fascicle ten of *Garden of the Dharma* as a variant version (T 53.363c). A comparison of the stories in these two works with *Times Now Past* shows how the compiler of *Times Now Past* selected elements from both sources to produce a new interpretation of Prince Siddhārtha's character based on his reactions to the garments in the story. *Cause and Effect* shows the Prince having doubts about his clothing:

> He then looked at the clothes he was wearing on his body, even with [its] seven jewels, and he thought to himself, "The manner of home-leaving of the Buddhas of the past was in the clothing they wore. This manner is inappropriate."

自見其身所著之衣。猶是七寶。即心念言。過去諸佛出家之法。所著衣服。不当如此。(T 3.634a)

The hunter is described as wearing a *kesa*, and the Prince refers to it as the robe of cessation and tranquility, the banner (*shiki* 幟) of the Buddhas of the past. The dialogue between the Prince and the hunter is nearly identical to *Times Now Past*, including the hunter's explanation of his use of the robe to trick the deer into approaching him.

Garden of the Dharma handles the issue of the hunter's robe more subtly. It describes the hunter as carrying a bow and arrow in his hand and wearing a robe dyed the color of *kaṣāya.* The prince expresses no regret about his own fine garments, but without preamble he begins to bargain by offering his own robe whose value, he claims, is one billion gold pieces. He explains in verse:

This robe of the holy ones who are liberated
Is not suitable to wear for one carrying bow and arrow
Arouse great happiness [by giving it to me]
Generously exchange with me [this] robe received from heaven
此是解脱聖人衣
若執弓不合著
汝發歓喜心
莫惜共我傳天衣。 (T 53.363c).

The hunter readily agrees, they exchange clothes, and the incident ends with a final image of the Prince setting out on his new life as a serious mendicant, with shaved head, wearing *kesa,* and declaring himself to have truly left home. As in the story in *Times Now Past*, the Prince expresses no regret about the suitability of his palace robes, and although the hunter's robe is described merely as being dyed the color of *kaṣāya*, the Prince immediately recognizes it as a holy garment. Is this, however, a case where the

holiness of the garment is in the eye of the beholder? The *Garden of the Dharma* version does not contain the hunter's explanation that he uses the robe as a way to deceive the deer, thereby preserving the ambiguity that to ordinary eyes this garment is a robe dyed a color suitable for hunters, but to one who has insight it is a holy garment. The omission of the conversation about using the garment to attract the deer also makes this version considerably less critical of the hunter. The Prince's final declaration in *Garden of the Dharma* is more modest, as he merely claims to have become a home-leaver, without predicting his future role as one who will save all beings.

Compilers of *Times Now Past* cobbled together a new version of the story using elements from both *Cause and Effect* and *Garden of the Dharma*, to portray Prince Siddhārtha as confident and unusually prescient. In *Times Now Past*, the Prince expresses no doubts about the suitability of his own palace robes. He instantly recognizes the hunter's garb as the *kesa* worn by the Buddha of the past, and puts the hunter on the defensive by questioning whether wearing the *kesa* as a hunter is a sin. The ambiguity of the garment is erased along with the diffidence of the newly renunciate Prince that appears in other versions of the story. Perhaps more significantly for the meaning of the *kesa* in Japanese religious life, the story raises the issue of acting against the precepts while wearing the *kesa*, and of using *kesa* as a kind of disguise to hide one's intent.

The theme of not being what one appears to be is also seen in stories about the *kesa* in *Sand and Pebbles,* which was compiled during 1279-1283 by Mujū Ichien 無住一円 (1226-1312). In his preface Mujū comments that he was inspired to write the collection after a trip to the Ise shrine some fifteen years earlier.[14] The title, he explains, is a metaphor: through these stories he intends to extract the gold and jewels of the Buddha's teaching from the sand and pebbles of the events of ordinary life. The stories in the collection begin with illustrations of Buddhist teachings, shifting in the latter half to stories of Japanese medieval life for which the collection is mainly prized (Morrell

1985, 40-41).

In the sixth book Mujū lists scriptural sources for the merit of the *kesa*, interspersed with tales from Buddhist scriptures and local folk stories about the *kesa*.[15] Mujū begins with a story illustrating the power of the robe to protect the wearer. In this story a runaway horse had run over a monk wearing a *kesa*, but the monk and the *kesa* were unscathed, although his under-robes were torn to shreds. Mujū emphasizes the immediacy of the tale, explaining that it happened recently to a local man.

Mujū next uses a scriptural story to raise the issue of using the *kesa* as a disguise. The characters in the story are a hunter and Śākyamuni Buddha in one of his former lives as a bodhisattva who had been born in the form of a lion:

> Long ago, there was a lion with golden fur called Firm Vow [*Kensei* 堅誓]. A hunter thought he would kill the lion and skin it to present [the hide] to the King. The hunter shaved his head to look like a monk, hiding a bow and a poisoned arrow under the *kesa*. He approached the lion, who, seeing the form of a monk, felt drawn to him and came up to him, waving his tail. [The hunter] took out the poison arrow and shot him. The lion then knew it was a hunter, and considered biting him. On second thought, it occurred to him that a person who hides in the *kesa*, even if his intentions are not good, is bound to become a Buddha because of the karmic connection of [having] a form that resembles a disciple of the Buddha. At first the lion intended to harm the hunter but in the end he endured [the pain] and died. This was the Bodhisattva practice of Śākyamuni.
>
> 昔堅誓師子ト云テ、金色ノモアル師子アリケリ。猟師アリテ、此師子ヲ殺シテ皮ヲ剥テ王ニ奉ラムト思テ、頭ヲソリ僧形トナリテ、毒ノ箭ト弓ヲ袈裟ノ下ニ隠シテ、是ニ近ク。師子、僧ノ形ヲ見テ、ナツカシク思テ、尾ヲ振テ近クニ、毒箭ヲモテ是ヲ射ル。師子、其時、コレ猟師ナリト知

テ、カマムと思フ。又思ハク、袈裟ヲカクル程ノ物ハ、設心中ニ善心ナクトモ、此因縁ツイニ佛ニナルベシ。其形佛弟子ニ似タリ。イカガ害セムト思テ、ツイニ忍テ死ス。釋迦ノ因行ナり。(Watanabe 1966, 288-289)[16]

Although written in the third person, the reader is privy to the lion's thoughts. The hunter is ignorant of the power of wearing the *kesa*, but the lion understands what it means, similar to Siddhārtha's recognition of the *kesa* as more than hunter's garb in the story in *Times Now Past.* Mujū uses this story to illustrate the power of the robe to overcome the effects of impure actions.

This mismatch between the wearer's intention and the future karmic consequences of wearing the *kesa* is also seen in two similar stories that Mujū merely refers to as if they were well known to his audience. One is the story of a Brahman, who, while still drunk, shaved his head and became a home-leaver. The other is that of the nun, Utpalavarṇā (*Uhatsura bikuni* 優鉢羅丘尼), who once wore a *kesa* as a joke. In both cases the act undertaken in unconsciousness or mockery has the unintended consequence of karmically binding the person to Buddhism. Mujū cites scriptural passages stating that the appearance of goodness should be respected, even when the wearer breaks the precepts.[17] Mujū then sums up the story of the lion, commenting,

> Firm Vow the Lion did not see the good and bad in the mind [of the hunter]. Earnestly he gazed at the outer form, reverencing it. All the more in this last age, there is certainly no doubt about the benefit of according with the dharma.
>
> 堅誓師子（ノ）心ナラバ、内心ノ得失ヲ見ズ、偏に外相ヲ崇ムト見ヘタリ。マシテ末代ナリタモ如法ナラム 益は無疑ひ。 (Watanabe 1966, 290)[18]

In this comment Mujū approves of the lion's reverence for form as a model for the believer during the unfortunate period of *mappō.* Even if the *kesa* disguises a scoundrel, one should reverence the form of the monk.

The rhetorical style of *Sand and Pebbles* has notable differences from *Times Now Past.* Mujū begins with a local legend, then delivers a short commentary on the merit of the *kesa*, including references to scriptural sources. This is followed by the story of Firm Vow the Lion that illustrates the double point that the *kesa* may be a disguise for an evil intent, but its merit is so powerful that simply wearing it creates a karmic connection that will eventually result in awakening. Mujū then discusses teachings of Daoxuan on the *kesa* and he ends the section with more local legends about priests, *kesa* and tree spirits. Mixing scriptural references with local legends is similar to the style of *Garden of the Dharma,* but unlike this encyclopedic work, Mujū's narrative voice and running commentary conveys his own personal perspective. In contrast, there are no explicit references to scriptural sources and no personalized narrator in the story from *Times Now Past*. Both tale collections present new versions of scriptural stories. They characterize the *kesa* as a potential disguise, whose merit is inviolate. Also, Siddhārtha is portrayed as prescient and confident. He perceives the merit of the *kesa,* regardless of the deceptive circumstances. The following section, which discusses the role of the *kesa* during *mappō,* gives a more systematic treatment of these themes.

Part 3. *Mappō* thought and the *Kesa* during the Medieval Period

During the Kamakura period concerns about the efficacy of Buddhist practice became increasingly urgent. Scriptures and treatises that describe three distinct stages (*shōzōmatsu* 正像末) of deterioration of the Buddha's teaching after his final Nirvana influenced East Asian Buddhist cultures.[19] According to these scriptures, during the period of the True Dharma (*shōbō* 正法) which was believed to have lasted from five hundred to one thousand years after the final *nirvana* of the Buddha, his teaching flourishes and disciples who follow its precepts attain awakening. During the following

stage of the Semblance Dharma (*shōbō* 像法), which lasts five hundred to one thousand years, the teaching and the practice of the precepts continue but the possibilities for awakening diminish. By the time of the Latter Dharma (*mappō* 末法), precepts and awakening have disappeared and only the teachings remain. At the end of this period even the Buddha's teaching would vanish. By different methods of calculation the period of *mappō* was due to occur between fifteen hundred and two thousand years after the death of the Buddha. The concept of *mappō* was known in Japan during the Nara period, but had little influence on the popular imagination until the twelfth century when a series of natural disasters and political disturbances seemed to herald the kind of upheavals of the waning days of the Buddhist teaching that were promised in scriptures. Since following the precepts was thought to be impossible during *mappō*, Buddhist writers during the Kamakura period believed that the definition of the monk and the function of the *kesa* as the banner of the Buddhist teaching had to be reconsidered in the context of *mappō.*

The *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma*, a collection of citations from scripture traditionally attributed to Saichō (767-822), was a significant source of ideas about *mappō* during the Kamakura period (Rhodes 1980, 82-85). During the medieval period Saichō's authorship was unquestioned in spite of the fact that approaches to the problems of *mappō* recommended in *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* contradict teachings in Saichō's authenticated works.[20] The *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* was considered an authoritative source for Buddhist practice during the age of *mappō.* Its ideas about the inefficacy of practice in the time of *mappō* were adopted by Hōnen 法然 (1133-1212) who is credited as the founder of the Pure Land (*Jōdo* 浄土) school (Stone 1985, 39). Hōnen's disciple, Shinran 親鸞 (1173-1262), who founded the True Pure Land (*Jōdo shin* 浄土真) school extensively quotes from the *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* in his writings (Stone 1985, 43).

Lamplight of the Latter Dharma argues that under the conditions of *mappō* monks and nuns cannot follow the precepts. Instead they adopt the outer appearance of a home-leaver by shaving the head and wearing *kesa*, thereby becoming a monk in name only (*myōji biku* 名字比丘).[21] *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* argues:

> In the Last Dharma age only the teachings exist, but not their practice or their realization. Where the Dharma exists as precepts, there it is possible to violate the precepts. But where the Dharma no longer exists as precepts, what precepts are there to violate in order for there to be precept violations? And where precepts violations no longer exist, how much more so is it true of precept observance!
>
> ...in the Last Dharma-age monks will exist in title only. This title will be regarded as the world's true treasure, for there will be no other sphere in which good exists. If there is someone during the Last Dharma-age who would adhere to the precepts, he is to be looked upon with suspicion. (Ryūkoku University Translation Center, 1980, 128; Matsubara 1978, 180-181)

This passage suggests that taking precepts in the context of *mappō* is ineffective. The potential ineffectiveness of the precepts during *mappō* is a crucial matter because it alters the relationship between the monk as a field of merit and the laity as donors. A monk without the power of the precepts is no longer worthy of donations. If the conditions of *mappō* preclude taking the precepts, then one who claims to be following the precepts must therefore be deceitful.

Lamplight of the Latter Dharma then describes a progressive devaluation of Buddhist practice during these distinct periods, citing fascicle nine of the *Great Collection Scripture* (*Mahā-saṃnipāta-sūtra*; *Daijikkyō* 大集経; T 13. no. 397) which draws an analogy between the phases of Buddhist teachings and the relative value of metals.[22] Gold is valuable, but when there is no gold, then silver is valued, and so on

down to lead and tin. Analogously, as the Buddhist teaching degenerates, the highest levels of spiritual attainment become gradually unavailable, and the next lower rank becomes the highest good. By the time of *mappō*, the monk in name only who shaves his beard and head and wears a *kesa* has become the field of merit by showing others the outer form of the monk. One may attain awakening by protecting and making offerings to this monk (T 13.363b). In this reappraisal of who is worthy of receiving offerings during *mappō*, one need not actually receive the precepts (*kaitai* 戒体) in order to become a field of merit. Merely appearing as the field of merit makes one worthy of offerings.

In a context where the appearance of the monk is the remaining indication of the Buddhist faith, the *kesa* looms large. *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* makes it clear that these monks in name and appearance only are still worthy of donations, citing fascicle fifty-five of the *Great Collection Scripture* which states: "The crime of striking and reproaching a monk who breaks the precepts and the monk without the precepts who wears the *kaṣāya* is the same as causing a trillion Buddhas to shed blood." (T 13.354a and c; Rhodes 1980, 99). In all of these citations, the *kesa* and the shorn hair are the last links with the Buddha. The *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* argues that the power of the merit of the *kesa* is so strong that it can eventually bring about the awakening of the monk. Therefore, the merit of giving to the monk remains intact. Thus, during *mappō* the *kesa* continues to protect the spiritual progress of those who wear it. *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* cites the [*Great*] *Scripture of the Ten Wheels* ([*Dafang guang*] *shilun jing* [大方廣] 十輪經, T 13. no. 410) in regard to monks who practice evil ways but still wear the *kesa* and shave the head:

> If a person takes up the religious life based on my Dharma and still commits evil practices, then although he may call himself a monk, he is not one, and although he may call his practices pure they are not pure. Nonetheless, this kind of monk is

> still able to reveal the hidden storehouse of all goodness and virtue to every deity, serpent and spirit, and hence he becomes a good master to sentient beings. Although he is neither scant in desires nor sufficient in knowledge, he shaves his head, dons the robes of the Dharma, and by means of this link is able to increase the root of goodness for sentient beings and to reveal the way of goodness to deities and men (T 13.693-694a; Ryūkoku University Translation Center 1980, 132).

The passage goes on to compare the virtue of the monk to the use of a cow's liver as medicine or the scent of the musk of the deer. Although the animals are dead, the potency of the liver and the musk continue. Similarly, wearing the *kesa* has the positive effect of nurturing the spiritual path for oneself and others because it carries the original potency of the Buddha dharma which is now at a low ebb. As a link to the time when the Buddha's teaching was fully effective, the *kesa* concentrates and preserves the vitality of the teaching even in the diminished circumstances of *mappō.*

Lamplight of the Latter Dharma also cites passages in which the *kesa* plays a negative role. During *mappō*, the *kesa* may become a disguise, parading the false as true. *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* quotes fascicle seven of the *Scripture of the Great Decease* (*Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra*; *Da banniepan jing* 大般涅槃經, T 12. no. 374) which describes the destruction of the Buddha's teaching as a systemic replacement of true monks with false monks. The passage paraphrased in *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* quotes the Buddha's explanation to his disciple, Mahākāśyapa:

> Seven hundred years after *parinirvāṇa* evil beings will gradually appear and do violence to my right Dharma. They will be like hunters who clothe themselves in the robes of the Dharma. Other evil beings will also do likewise, taking on the semblance of monks and nuns or of laymen and laywomen. Moreover, they will

appear as the body of a stream-winner or an *arhat* and even as the Buddha's material body. These evil beings will use their own tainted form to take on an untainted body, and they will thereby do violence to my Right Dharma (Ryūkoku Translation Center 1980, 131; Matsubara 1978, 185-186)[23]

The reference to "hunters who clothe themselves in the robes of the Dharma" suggests that the image of a hunter wearing *kesa* is a sign of the false monk in contrast to the positive good of the heavenly being disguised as a hunter wearing *kesa* and appearing before Prince Siddhārtha. Introducing this familiar and revered image as a symbol of the degeneration of the dharma underlines the sense of betrayal and deception of *mappō*.

Another negative view is that the *kesa* itself changes during *mappō*. *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* summarizes a passage from the *Scripture of Great Māya* (*Mo ho mo ye jing* 摩訶摩耶經, T 12. no. 383). The passage from the scripture states:

> ...After 1200 years all the monks and nuns will not practice celibacy [*brahmacarya*]. If they have children, the boys will become monks and the girls will become nuns. After 1300 years the *kesa* will change to white and will not accept the color of the dye. After 1400 years all the four groups [of Buddhists] will even become like hunters, taking pleasure in killing and selling the objects belonging to the three treasures.
>
> 千二百已。是諸比丘及比丘尼。作非梵行。若有子息。男為比丘。女為比丘尼。千三百已。袈裟變白不受染色。千四百已。時諸四衆猶如獵師。好樂殺生賣三寶物。 (T 12.1013c)[24]

Like the monks and nuns who no longer accept precepts, the *kesa* will not accept dye and is thereby no longer the distinctive garment of the monk. In the context of monks and nuns who mate and have children, all robes by definition become lay robes, that is, white robes. The hunter image reappears in a distinctly negative light as one who takes

pleasure in killing and sells off the common property of the monasteries. These passages suggest that the attitude of the *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* toward the *kesa* during *mappō* is primarily negative, even in its positive aspects.

Lamplight of the Latter Dharma was used as a resource for teachings about Buddhist practice that were appropriate for the conditions of *mappō.* Hōnen used citations from this work in his sermons to support his claim that evoking the name of Amida 阿弥陀 was the only practice suitable for the age of *mappō* (Rhodes 1980, 82-83).[25] This text also had a strong influence on Shinran who quoted most of the text in his work, *Teaching, Practice, Faith and Enlightenment* (*Kyōgyōshinshō* 教行信証). The *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* may be the basis for Shinran's argument that the true monk is without precepts, and his decision to marry and become "neither monk nor layman" (Rhodes 1980, 84).

Although Dōgen does not refer to the *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* by name, some fascicles of the *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma* (*Shōbō genzō* 正法眼藏) appear to rely on it. In "Merit of Leaving Home" (*Shukke kudoku* 出家功德), Dōgen refers to each of three claims in *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma*: first, the efficacy of giving to a monk in name only who shaves his hair and dons the robe; second, the dire consequences of harming this monk; and three, the promise of awakening for the monk in name only (Mizuno 1993, 4.78-79).[26] In "Merit of the *Kesa*" Dōgen refers to the idea of the monk in name only:

> Now in our far away country during the period of *mappō* people shave their beard and hair and are called the disciples of the Buddha, but they do not receive and maintain the *kesa* and do not believe that they should, and it is not made clear. It is deplorable.
>
> いま遠方邊土の澆季剃除鬚髮して佛弟子と稱する、袈裟を受持せず。いま

だ受持すべきと信せず、あきらめず。かなしむべし。(DZZ 1.624)[27]

In this passage Dōgen accepts the notion of the monk in name only (without using the name for it) but he points out that the *kesa* is an essential element. Rather than criticizing those who break the precepts, he is concerned that those who are called the disciples of the Buddha, that is, the monks in name only, have not fully taken on the practice of receiving and maintaining the *kesa*. Dōgen's meaning in this passage is more complex that it seems because there is no doubt that monks wore *kesa* in his time. Rather than emphasizing appearance and whether monks wear garments called *kesa*, Dōgen's interest is in the one time ritual act of properly receiving the *kesa* and the daily ritual acts that comprise maintaining the *kesa*, that is, the *kesa* in a living practice. I will discuss Dōgen's attitude toward the *kesa* in more detail in chapter five.

The *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* has an ambivalent attitude toward the *kesa*, portraying it on the one hand as the disguise of the false monks of *mappō*, and, on the other hand, as the true sign of the monk in name only. In Kamakura Buddhism, however, the negative view expressed in *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* was counterbalanced by texts that presented a clearly positive view of the role of the *kesa* in protecting and developing the spiritual growth of the wearer who doubts or breaks the precepts. An example is the story of the nun Utpalavarṇā from fascicle thirteen of the *Treatise of Great Wisdom* (*Dazhi du lun* 大智度論, T 25. no. 1509).[28] She had been a prostitute who had worn the *kesa* to make people laugh, and was later reborn during Kāśyapa Buddha's lifetime. Finally, during Śākyamuni Buddha's time, Utpalavarṇā became an *arhat* due to the good karmic connection that she had inadvertently established so long ago by wearing the *kesa* as a joke. Utapalavarṇā visited the homes of laywomen and urged them to become home-leavers, arguing that even if circumstances led them to break the precepts and fall into hell they would eventually attain awakening as she had done (T 25.161a).

Although she broke the precepts and fell into hell as a result, the merit of wearing a *kesa* even as a joke created a link with the power of the teaching that led to her eventual awakening.

Part 4. *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* : the Power of the *Kesa* as Vow

Similarly, the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* described a salvific role for the *kesa* in an impure world, based on the power of Śākyamuni's five hundred vows as a bodhisattva in a previous life. The final five vows define the merit of the *kesa*. During the Kamakura period *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* became the focus for beliefs about a prophesy that the relics of the Buddha would be reconstituted in Japan as a divine manifestation, the so-called great shining spirit (*daimyōjin* 大明神). Although there is no mention of a prophecy about relics in the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*, the juxtaposition of this prophecy and the five vows about the *kesa* that appear in the scripture may have led to the belief that the *kesa* itself was a kind of bodily relic of the Buddha.

The *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* belongs to the Pure Land class of scriptures in which a bodhisattva makes vows (*praṇidhāna*) that lead to a prediction (*vyākaraṇa*) of the beneficial characteristics of his future Buddha land.[29] Among pure land scriptures, the Scripture of Infinite Light and Life, *Sukhāvatīvyūha Sūtra* (*Wu liang shou jing* 無量壽經, T 12. no. 360) describes the pure land vowed by Amitābha (Amida 阿弥陀) Buddha in forty-eight vows. Of these, the thirty seventh vow concerns the Buddhist robe:

> Blessed One, may I not awaken to unsurpassed, perfect, full awakening if, after I attain awakening, a single bodhisattva remains who has to wash, dry, sew or dye his robes, or if the moment a bodhisattva thinks of any of these tasks, he does not find himself fully dressed in magnificent, noble robes, always newly made and approved by the Tathāgata (Gomez 1996, 74).

The vow is expressed in the characteristic double negative: "May I not awaken to unsurpassed, perfect, full awakening if, after I attain awakening...(X does not happen)". Stated positively, the vow says since that Amida Buddha is awakened, his pure land necessarily contains these characteristics. The thirty-seventh vow as stated in this scripture does not assert the merit of the Buddhist robe. The robes are newly made monastic robes of new cloth, not scraps of discarded cloth as in the rag robe, and of course, these robes are indisputably "according to the *dharma.*"

In contrast, the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* explains why Śākyamuni Buddha chose to teach in an impure Buddha land. It explains that in a former life Śākyamuni was the bodhisattva Samudrareṇu, practicing under Buddha Ratnagarbha. Given the choice of directing his vows to either a pure or an impure Buddha land, Samudrareṇu announced his determination to help suffering beings by preaching in an impure Buddha land. Of the five hundred vows expressing this intention, the final five vows about the robe are referred to as the five merits of the robe.

The first of the five vows concerning the robe addresses the problem of the follower whose belief in the Buddha falters. Samudrareṇu pronounces this vow to Ratnagharba:

> World Honored One, When I have become Buddha, then maybe a person who has entered my *dharma* and become a home-leaver wears the *kesa.* If the same person accumulates grave sins or practices false views, is not respectful of the three treasures, treating them with contempt and disbelief, whether the person be monk or nun, layman or laywoman, there [may] arise [in this person] one thought of respect for the world honored one, or his teaching or his community. If even one such person does not attain the three vehicles and a prediction [to become a Buddha], but loses the way, then in all the ten directions without measure,

limitless and countless Buddhas of the present must not have attained *anuttarā samyaksaṃbodhiḥ.*

世尊。我成佛已若有衆生入我法中出家著袈裟者。或犯重戒或行邪見。若於三寶輕毀不信集諸重罪。比丘比丘尼優婆塞優婆夷。若於一念中生恭敬心。尊重世尊或於法僧。世尊。如是衆生乃至一人不於三乘得授記別而退轉者。則為欺誑十方世界無量無邊阿僧祇等現在諸佛。必定不成阿耨多羅三藐三菩提 (fasc. 8, T 3.220a).

This vow uses the double negative form, but instead of focusing solely on the awakening of Samudrareṇu, it declares the awakening of all the present Buddhas null if the vow is not fulfilled. The condition described in the vow is similar to that of *mappō* in that the home-leaver has lost faith in the Buddha's teaching and has broken the precepts. By highlighting Śākyamuni's Buddha land as impure, the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* challenges the premise of *mappō*: if Śākyamuni's Buddha land is impure, then the difficulties faced by his followers even during Śākyamuni's presence in this world would have hindrances similar to those faced by *mappō*. The backsliding monk who breaks the precepts is to be expected in an impure land, but thanks to the power of the vow that imbues the *kesa*, even one thought of respect for the Buddha, his dharma and his community will guarantee realization.

The second through the fifth of Samudrareṇu's five vows address the sufferings of other beings, promising physical, spiritual and political benefits to human and non-human beings through contact with the robe. Each of these vows are written as a positive assertion rather than the double negative form of the first vow. The second vow states that if there is one among heavenly beings, low caste people and hungry ghosts who venerates and sees the robe will not backslide in the practice of the three vehicles. The third states that if any of those suffering from hunger and thirst get even a small part of

the robe, then their hunger will be satisfied. The fourth states that when beings come into conflict with each other, if even one recalls the robe to mind, then its virtue will cause his mind to become compassionate, pliant, non-aggressive, liberated, and controlled. Finally, if a person finds himself among those who intend to resolve matters through conflict, if he has even a small piece of the robe that he has respectfully worshipped, then he will be protected from harm. Here the merit of the *kesa* is not limited to monks. The vow includes laity and non-human rebirths, giving a broader scope to the power of the *kesa*. This power is activated by even casual contact with a fragment or by merely seeing or remembering it, and its benefits are not limited to spiritual cultivation but confer political and military benefits as well.

The *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* enabled enthusiasts to argue that Śākyamuni Buddha is more compassionate than Amida because of his deliberate choice of a defiled world for his Buddha land. Those who wished to mitigate the influence of Amida Buddhism and to address the degeneration of monastic discipline used this text to promote faith in Śākyamuni.[30] For example, Myōe 明恵 (1173-1232) used the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* as the basis of his faith in the relics of Śākyamuni, particularly in support of the theory that "the Buddha's relics create Buddhism" (Kirino 1999, 120a). The *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* also influenced the Hossō prelate Jōkei 貞慶 (1155-1213) who sought to revive monastic practice (Narita 1963, 685). In 1198 Jōkei used the scripture to dedicate *stūpas* (*tō* 塔) to Śākyamuni and in 1202 he publicly recited a verse extolling the great compassion of Śākyamuni's vow to help all beings in the impure world. In the verse, Jōkei claims that Śākyamuni's choice proves his great spiritual power as well as our deep obligation (*tokuon* 徳恩) to Śākyamuni Buddha.[31] The Shingon priests Eison 叡尊 (1201-1290) and Ninshō 忍性 (1217-1303) also used the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* as a justification for faith in Śākyamuni and as a cornerstone of their revival of monastic discipline, developing Saidaiji 西大寺 as a center

of *vinaya* studies. Eison administered the bodhisattva precepts among the poor, including those whose occupations caused them to break the precepts such as hunters and prostitutes.[32] Eison encouraged his many followers to make vows following the model of *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* (Narita 1963, 686-687). References to the scripture also appear in writings of the new schools of Buddhism that developed during the Kamakura period.[33]

The popularity of *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* during the Kamakura period depended in part on a prediction that Śākyamuni's relics, which were believed to have been distributed throughout the world at his death, would someday be reconstituted in Japan as the form of the great shining spirit (*daimyōjin* 大明神).[34] The prediction concerning the *daimyōjin* appeared in texts of the Tōmitsu 東密 school of esoteric Buddhism as early as 1164 and became a feature of apocryphal texts purporting to explain the five hundred vows of Śākyamuni (Misaki 1961, 16). The prediction was always prefaced by the phrase "as the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* says," as though it were an accurate citation from that text, even though this scripture does not promote worship of relics, and of course, never refers to a *daimyōjin* (Misaki 1961, 17).[35] Misaki suggests that those who worshipped the relics of Śākyamuni were mainly attracted to the explanation of Śākyamuni's five hundred vows in the scripture. He argues that texts that link the prediction of the world-wide distribution of relics to one of these five hundred vows attributed the phrase to the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*. Through this false attribution, the text became a focus not only for worship of Śākyamuni Buddha and his relics but was also used to confirm the ideology of a mutual relationship between the gods and Buddhas.[36]

In most cases during the medieval period authors claiming to cite the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*, are actually quoting from a number of apocryphal texts about the "Five Hundred vows." Perhaps one of the most influential of these is the two

fascicle *Scripture of Five Hundred Vows of Śākyamuni Tathāgata* (*Shaka nyorai gohyaku taigan* 釋迦如来五百大願經), discovered in a storehouse of Kōzanji 高山寺 in Kyōto where Myōe was prelate (Narita 1965, 548).[37] This text is thought to be the basis for other apocryphal texts that promoted religious practices centered on the five hundred vows of Śākyamuni.

Ishikawa (1995) argues that passages in Dōgen's *Shōbō genzō* that refer to the "five hundred vows of Śākyamuni" show stylistic elements characteristic of these apocryphal texts. He points out that in "Merit of the *Kesa*" Dōgen cites the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* as the source of the five vows concerning the *kesa* but Ishikawa's textual analysis shows that Dōgen neither quoted directly from the original scripture, nor did he rely on the *Scripture of Five Hundred Vows of Śākyamuni Tathāgata*. Ishikawa suggests that Dōgen was referring instead to *The Scripture of the Teaching of the Five hundred Original Vows of Śākyamuni* (*Śākyamuni nyorai gohyaku hongan hōmon kyō* 釋迦如来五百本願法門經).[38] Dōgen's use of this text shows that he knew about the belief that the relics of the Buddha would be reconstituted in Japan. His own remarks about Śākyamuni's five vows about the *kesa* provide further evidence of his interest in the relationship of the *kesa* to the physical relics of the Buddha.

In "Merit of the *Kesa*" Dōgen quotes the five vows about the robe from the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*, but he changes the text of the first vow. As explained above, the first vow turns on a change of mental attitude in the person who has fallen away from the teaching. The original scripture says that: "if there arises one thought of respect and reverence for the world honored one, or his teaching or his community," then the spiritual progress of the person is ensured. Dōgen alters the text here to read (emphasis my own):

If in one moment of thought there arises respect, <u>reverence for the</u>

saṅghāṭī robe, and the arousal of a respectful mind and reverence for the world honored one, or his teaching or his community.

若シ於テ一念中、生恭敬心尊重僧伽梨衣生恭敬心尊重世尊或於法僧。 (DZZ 1.631)[39]

As explained in the first chapter, the *saṅghāṭī* robe is the double layered great robe, closely associated with Śākyamuni Buddha and his early disciples. By adding these phrases, Dōgen puts reverence for the *kesa* on a level with reverence for the Buddha, while demonstrating his willingness to rewrite the scripture so that it reflects his own views of the *kesa*.

At the end of the citation of the five vows, Dōgen comments that the merit of receiving a robe in the teaching of Śākyamuni is far superior to robes that followers receive from other Buddhas. He argues that the power of the five hundred vows that Śākyamuni took in the presence of Ratnagarbha are concentrated in the final five vows concerning the robe. The robe thus distills the merit of all five hundred vows:

> Truly, the *kesa* is the Buddha garment of all Buddhas in the three time periods. Even though one speaks of the merit of the *kesa* as unlimited, obtaining the *kesa* in Śākyamuni's teaching must even be superior to the *kesa* [obtained] in the teaching of other Buddhas. This is because long ago when Śākyamuni was a bodhisattva, a great compassionate bodhisattva, when he proposed the five hundred great vows as he stood before Ratnagarbha Buddha, he especially imbued the merit of the *kesa* with [the merit] established in each one of the [five hundred] vows. This merit must therefore be even more immeasurable and marvelous. If this is the case, then the *kesa* is now the proper transmission of the skin, flesh bones and marrow of the World Honored One.

まことにそれ、袈裟は三世諸佛の佛衣なり。その功徳無量なりといえども、釋迦牟尼佛の法のなかにして袈裟のえたらんは、餘佛の法のなかにして袈裟をえんにもすぐれたるべし。ゆヱいかんとなれば、釋迦牟尼佛むかし因地のとき、大悲菩薩摩訶薩として、寶藏佛のみまへにして五百の大願をたてましますとき、ことさらこの袈裟の功徳におきて、かくのごとく誓願をおこしまします。その功徳、さらに無量不可思議なるべし。しかあればすなはち、世尊の皮肉骨髄いまに正伝するといふは袈裟衣なり。 (DZZ 1.633)[40]

In this passage Dōgen interprets the scripture as saying that because Śākyamuni concentrated the merit of all five hundred vows in the merit of his *kesa*, it is superior to the *kesa* of other Buddhas. A key element in his argument is that this *kesa* is not the garment worn by the historical Śākyamuni Buddha. Its merit is therefore not derived from its status as a contact relic. Dōgen is speaking of the *kesa* that was vowed by Śākyamuni in a former life when he established his Buddha land as an impure world. It is this *kesa* of the impure world, Dōgen argues, that in this moment properly transmits Śākyamuni Buddha's skin, flesh, bones and marrow.[41] Dōgen's discussion of the meaning of the vows concerning the *kesa* suggests that he was aware of the apocryphal prediction attributed to *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* and its use in worship of Śākyamuni and his relics.

Dōgen's interpretation of the vows of Śākyamuni offers a perspective on the relationship of vow, prediction, and the bodily relics of the Buddha which contrasts with the belief in the reconstitution of Śākyamuni's bodily relics in the apocryphal texts mentioned above. In Dōgen's view the *kesa* manifests in this world because of the previous vow and prediction that Śākyamuni's teaching will occur in an impure Buddha land. Rather than being reconstituted as the *Daimyōjin*, however, Dōgen argues that the

force of the vow transmits the skin, flesh, bones and marrow of Śākyamuni Buddha as the *kesa*. Because of this *kesa*, the Buddha land is manifested here in the impure world. Japan's remoteness in time and place from the birthplace of Buddhism is therefore transcended through the properly transmitted *kesa*.

Both Dōgen's writings and the apocryphal texts shifted the focus to the present, to seeing the impure world itself as the place of Buddhist practice, rather than seeing the Buddha land as a remote possibility (Ishikawa 1992, 756).[42] The way that the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* was used in these writings is similar to tale literature that seeks to demonstrate the manifestation of Buddhist teachings as local and contemporary.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have surveyed texts which were the most influential in shaping beliefs about the *kesa* during the late Heian and Kamakura periods. *Garden of the Dharma* was used extensively as a source for scriptural citations about the *kesa* since the Nara period, and during later years it influenced the development of tale literature by providing an example of how indigenous tales could be reshaped as Buddhist tales. Many of the scriptural sources it quotes contain engaging scriptural stories about the *kesa* that could easily be adapted in sermons. Tale literature, with the mixed Chinese and Japanese written style pioneered in *Times Now Past* extended the range of *Garden of the Dharma* by reinterpreting the characters of these stories in ways that would appeal to a Japanese audience. Tale literature also provided a way to illustrate Buddhist truths enacted in the present and in Japan. A favorite theme is the notion of the *kesa* used as a disguise, which has a positive effect even though the wearer is unaware of it. The notion that the *kesa* remains pure despite the wearer's actions became part of folklore as well as more scholarly treatments of the *kesa*. By the time Mujū composed *Sand and Pebbles* the form of tale literature had developed to the point where Mujū not only acts as narrator, but also moves nimbly between scriptural stories, commentary and tales of local and recent manifestations of the merit of the *kesa*. His brief mention of some of the scriptural

sources explained in *Garden of the Dharma* suggests that in Mujū's time these texts had become more commonly known.

The *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* promoted the image of the monk in name only as worthy of reverence in an age in which precepts could no longer be taken or upheld. The *kesa*, whose merit was unaffected by *mappō*, became one of the last remaining signs of the Buddha, concentrating the power of the Buddha's teaching even as it fades away, like the musk of a fallen animal. In this case, the merit of the *kesa* derives from the fact of its having been worn by the Buddha and his disciples during the time of the True Dharma. Its power, therefore, derives from its status as a contact relic.

Similarly, Daoxuan's dream as told in the *Garden of the Dharma* focuses on the *kesa* as a relic. Although Japanese Buddhists do not seem to have explicitly used this dream in their own writings, those who referred to the short section on robes in *Garden of the Dharma* would surely have been aware of it. In the climax of the dream, the *saṅghātī kesa* preserved in the reliquary are released into the world when the teaching is at its lowest ebb so that they may, in conjunction with the power of the ordination platform, revive the Buddha's teaching. This interpretation of the *kesa* contains a slight ambiguity. On the one hand, as the garment of Kāśyapa and Śākyamuni Buddhas, the *kesa* is a contact relic. On the other hand, it is kept in a reliquary as if it were the bodily relics of a Buddha, and its role in reviving the dharma suggests that its power derives from it status as a bodily relic.

A different perspective is provided by the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* which describes Śākyamuni's vows in a former life that committed him to teaching in an impure Buddha land. The merit of the *kesa* in Śākyamuni's teaching directly addresses problems that arise in impurity. These vows stand in stark contrast to Amida's vow about the robe that anyone born into his pure land would automatically be clothed in robes according to

the dharma. In Amida's pure land there is no mention of the merit of the *kesa*, presumably because there is no longer any need for merit.

For the most part, the texts discussed above treat the *kesa* as a sign of the Buddha, his teachings and his disciples. There is little discussion of the physical specifics of the *kesa*, nor is there any differentiation between types of garments that the monk wears. In these texts the *kesa* is formless; in other words, it stands for all forms of the Buddha's robes. Two exceptions to this disembodied portrayal of the *kesa* are: first, the issue of the color of the garment in *Times Now Past*; and second, Dōgen's interpolation in the first vow of the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* where he refers specifically to the great robe (*saṅghātī*).

Scriptural accounts of Prince Siddhārtha setting out on his spiritual journey retained the ambiguity of the meaning of *kesa* as both a garment worn by a hunter and dyed the color of *kaṣāya*, or as a religious garment worn by a monk. Retold in *Times Now Past,* however, this ambiguity is excised, and the garment that the hunter wears is unequivocally a Buddhist robe. In this account, Prince Siddhārtha is portrayed as already cognizant of the symbols of his not yet attained Buddhahood. He not only knows what the *kesa* is; he is prepared to defend and protect it. The rich ambiguity of the first ascetic robe of Prince Siddhārtha and the meaning of the god taking the form of the hunter is lost. Confronted with this apparition, Prince Siddhārtha can only scold the hunter for his use of the *kesa*, and in so doing he forgets the inappropriateness of his own jeweled garments.

Dōgen's interpolation of the word *saṅghātī* at the critical turning point in the first vow of the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* puts the *kesa* on an equal level with the three treasures of Buddha, his teaching and community of followers, as if it were the fourth treasure. It is not, however, an unspecified, generalized *kesa*; it is the *saṅghātī,* the

double layered great robe worn when preaching to the laity, revered as the earliest type of Buddhist robe. Dōgen's use of the specific term *saṅghāṭī* instead of *kesa* is reminiscent of Daoxuan's dream as recounted in *Garden of the Dharma* where only the *saṅghāṭī* robes placed in the reliquary have the power to regenerate Buddhism. Daoxuan's vision may have influenced Dōgen's choice of *saṅghāṭī* over *kesa* in this interpolation, but if so, Dōgen's interpretation of this vow and his comments on the five merits of the *kesa* in *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* are the only hints I have found of a link between the *kesa* and the bodily relics of Śākyamuni Buddha, in spite of the great interest in relics during this period.

These two exceptions that provide physical details of the *kesa* only serve to prove the point that in texts of this period, when the merit of the *kesa* or its religious meaning are discussed, the term *kesa* usually does not point to a particular form. The materiality of the *kesa* and the particulars of color, size and design have little or no significance in these texts. In the Tokugawa period, however, the form of the *kesa* acquires great significance as Buddhists turned to matters of practice and attempted to define the robe "according to the *dharma.*"

---

1. Esoteric chroniclers of Mt. Hiei during the late Heian and the Kamakura periods envisioned the *kesa* as a map of the spiritual world (*mandara* 曼荼羅). Elaborations on the *kesa* as a spiritual map appeared in medieval Sōtō Zen secret documents called *kirikami* 切り紙 (Ishikawa 1985). This idea does not seem to have influenced the texts and religious communities covered in the present research.

2. The influence of *Garden of the Dharma* on tale literature is noted by Yamada (1959, 3). Ikegami (2001, 47-59) provides a more extensive analysis.

Ikegami (2001, 47-59) provides a more extensive analysis.

3. Shinohara (2000) gives a detailed discussion of the portrayal of the Buddhist robe in *Garden of the Dharma.* He pays special attention to Daoshi's description of an apocalyptic dream that Daoxuan believed was granted to him by the gods in the last year of his life (T 53.560a-563b).

4. For this section on *Garden of the Dharma*, unless otherwise noted, the first in-line citation refers to the passage in the Taishō edition of *Garden of the Dharma*; the second citation refers to Taishō edition of the original scriptural passage.

5. See also Shinohara (2000, 324).

6. The following summary of Daoxuan's dream is based on Shinohara (2000, 307-316).

7. The full title of the work is *A Record of Miraculous Manifestations of the Karmic Result of Good and Bad* [actions] (*Nihon koku genpō zen'aku ryōiki* 日本国現報善悪霊異記). The following discussion is based on Mills (1970, 5-7).

8. Kyōkai modeled his work on the seventh century *Ming bao ji*, extant only in Japanese manuscripts; and the eighth century *Banro yan ji* (Mills 1970, 6; n. 1).

9. Compilers of tales literature used the term "this realm" *honchō* 本朝 (Wilson 1973, 179). I am using the name "Japan."

10. Mills (1970, 24) explains that similarities between the preface of *Tales of Times Now Past* and that of the *Uji shūi* 宇治拾遺 by Minamoto no Takakuni 源隆國 (1004-1077), encouraged the view that *Times Now Past* was written by Takakuni. Modern scholars, however, reject this attribution because of references to events after Takakuni's death in 1077 and sources known to have been brought to Japan after 1120.

11. Silk (2003, 190-195) discusses these variations, providing two new translations.

12. See Silk's translations of the story in *Lalitavistara* and *Sanghabhedavastu.*

13. An English translation of the entire story is in Dykstra (1986, 73-79).

14. Morell (1985) provides a study of Mujū's life and his place in literature and in Kamakura period religious life. He translates *Sand and Pebbles* and a selection from Mujū's essay collection, *Zōtanshū* 雑談集. Ogino (1990, 303-329) has analyzed Mujū's attitude toward *mappō* in *Sand and Pebbles.*

15. Mujū lists several texts that were commonly used as sources for ideas about the merit of the *kesa* during *mappō*. I will discuss these sources in the following section on the affect of *the Mappō Tōmyōki* on Kamakura period attitudes toward the role of the *kesa* during *mappō*.

16. Watanabe (1966, 288) cites fascicle seven of *Scripture of Cause and Effect* (*Hōon kyō* 報恩經, T 3. no. 156); and fascicle thirteen of *Scripture of the Wise and Foolish* as two sources for this story. The description of the hunter's use of the *kesa* to disguise his weapons in this story bears no relationship to the dress of soldier monks, *sōhei* 僧兵, beginning in the Heian period. The soldier monk wears a five panel white *kesa* wrapped around the head so that only the eyes show (*katō* 裹頭) and his weapons are not concealed. For an illustration of this costume, see Costume Museum *Fuzoku hakubutsu kan,* "*katō o tsuketa sōhei* 裹頭をつけた僧兵" (Available online as of 2008 December 15 at: http://www.iz2.or.jp/fukushoku/).

17. Judging from his selections, it is likely that Mujū used the *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* for his citations.

18. For a different translation, see Morrell (1985, 195).

19. For a detailed discussion of ideas about the decline of Buddhism in different contexts, see Nattier (1991), especially chapter four, which deals with East Asian Buddhist cultures. For a discussion of *mappō* in Japanese Buddhist thought, see Stone (1985) and Marra (1998).

20. Groner (2000, 173; footnote 14) argues against Saichō's authorship of *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma*.

21. *Myōji biku* is also translated as "nominal monk". A longer expression, "monk in name only without precepts" (*mukai myōji biku* 無戒名字比丘) was also used. The expression "monk in name only" appears in fascicle one of the *Four Part Vinaya* in a description of one who has the appearance of a monk but breaks the precepts and does not repent (T 22.571a24).

22. The *Great Collection Scripture* is a collection of scriptures in 60 volumes that was translated over the course of several centuries. The earliest compositions date the time of Nāgārjuna (c. 150-250 CE). Lewis Lancaster (1979, 35) lists the completed group as translated by Dharmakṣema and others between 414-426 CE. See also Ono Genmyō (7: 477-483). These two citations are from fascicle 53 and 55 of the *Candragarbha* (*Yuezang jing* 月藏經) section, one of the oldest in the collection.

23. See also Rhodes (1980, 96).

24. *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* uses the alternative title for this scripture: *Daijūkyō* 大術經. See Matsubara (1978, 177: footnote). I have included a translation of the original text because *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma* merely paraphrases the passage, stating that in each of these hundred year periods, monks and nuns will have children, the robes will turn to white and the disciples of the Buddha will become like hunters and will sell the things of the three treasures.

25. Hōnen's references to this work appear in his collections of sermons: *Jūni Mondō* 十二問答 and *Gyakushū Seppō* 逆修説法 in Kuroda Shintō 黒田眞洞 and Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, ed. (1911): nos. 643 and 243.

26. "Merit of Leaving Home" is number fifty-eight of the Sixty Fascicle version of the *Treasury of the True Dharma Eye* whose compilation is traditionally attributed to Giun 義雲 (1253-1333). Recent scholarship by Kawamura Kōdō (1980, 1-75) suggests that this version was Dōgen's first draft arrangement of the chapters. The fascicle "Merit of Leaving Home" appears as the first of the Twelve Fascicle new draft (*shinsō* 新草) that Dōgen was writing in the last years of his life.

27. "Merit of the *Kesa*" is number forty-one of the Sixty Fascicle version of the *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma* and number three of the Twelve Fascicle version.

28. The name is derived from the name of a lotus flower with blue and red varieties. There are numerous variations on the Japanese pronunciation of the Sanskrit name which include: Upara, Utsuhara, Uhatsura. Two more variants on the name, *Uparage bikunu* 優鉢羅華比丘尼 and *Uparashiki* 優鉢羅色 are combined and abbreviated to form the name *Rengeshiki* 蓮華色. See "Upara" in ZGD (67c); and "Rengeshikibikuni" in ZGD (1308d).

29. Yamada (1968, 160) explains that *vyākaroti* means to answer a question in Pāli texts. A genre called *Vyākaraṇa* (Pāli: Veyyākaraṇa) meant a style of text using question and answer. When the answer concerned the future based on present conditions, the term *vyākaraṇa* means prediction, and refers specifically to a prediction given by a teaching Buddha to a bodhisattva who has made certain vows.

30. For an overview of recent scholarship on the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*, see Ujitani (1977); Kirino Kōgaku (1998), Nomura Takumi (1993, 1996). For the influence of this text on individual teachers, see Sugano Ryūichi (1987) for Shinran; and Ishikawa (1992 and 1995), Mizuno Yaoko (1995) and Sugano (1999) for Dōgen.

31. Sugano (1987, 162) cites in full the text of Jōkei's dedication at the Tōshōdaiji *Shaka nembutsu* ceremony in 1202 (DNB 105.21). Myōe's dedication at the 1204 *Nehan e*, is recorded in *Kōzanji Myōe shōnin gyōjō* 高山寺明恵上人行状 (*Dai Nihon shiryō* 5.7, 373). Myōe's references to the premise of the *Compassionate Lotus scripture* appears in his 1212 critique of Hōnen's teachings, *Saijarin* 摧邪輪 in Yamamoto, ed. (1930-1931): vol. 9.

32. Quinter describes how Eison incorporated the worship of Mañjuśri into his social welfare activities. A key idea in the ritual practices that Eison developed was the idea of Mañjuṣri as a bodhisattva who vowed to continue to transmigrate in order to save other sentient beings (Quinter 2007, 447). This concept is similar to Śākyamuni's decision to teach in an impure land.

33. See Nomura (1993) for a thorough discussion of the use of the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* from the late Heian through the Tokugawa period.

34. *Myō* refers to the shining light of the Buddha's wisdom as it is manifested in the form of the deity. The term (*dai*)*myōjin* is used in the doctrine of the interpenetration of the deities and Buddhas (*shinbutsu shūgō* 神仏習合) and is often, though not exclusively, a reference to the deities associated with the Kasuga shrine (Nakamura 2002, 1308; Grapard 1992, 211).

35. Misaki (1961) analyzes how the appearance of certain phrases not found in *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* indicate a false attribution. This includes

referring to the "five hundred vows of Śākyamuni," or listing individual vows by number, or using introductory words and frames for the vows which differ from the original.

36. Ruppert's (2000) study of the role of Buddha relics in medieval Japanese Buddhism makes no mention of this scripture. I have not yet found an English language study on the role of this scripture in Japanese Buddhism, but judging from Japanese scholarship, it would be a fruitful area for future research.

37. Narita (1965) gives details about the provenance of this manuscript. He also gives a summary of the text and quotes its version of the five hundred vows of Śākyamuni Buddha (Narita 1965, 552-558).

38. Ishikawa (1995, 232-233) states that a copy of this text was found at Nanatsudera 七寺 in Nagoya.

39. Ishikawa (1995, 233) notes that these phrases do not appear in the original *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* nor in the two apocryphal texts on the five hundred vows mentioned above. Although it is possible that Dōgen was referring to yet another text, it is also possible that he interpolated these words into the text of the first vow himself.

40. For a modern Japanese translation of this passage that follows Dōgen's text closely see Mizuno (1987, 99).

41. Dōgen may be alluding to Bodhidharma's legendary pronouncement to his four disciples that their expression of their understanding shows that they have, respectively, attained his own skin, flesh, bones, and marrow, that is, his true teaching. This story appears in the third fascicle of *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* (*Jingde zhuandeng lu* 景徳傳燈録, T 51.219c) compiled by Daoyuan in 1004 CE. With the exception of Mizuno (1987), modern Japanese and English

translators of Dōgen's "Merit of the *Kesa*" often collapse this four word phrase, translating it instead as "essence" (Yokoi 1976, 97); or as "Śākyamuni's Buddha dharma" *shakuson no buppō* 釈尊の仏法 (Nakamura 1972, 4.71), thus missing Dōgen's rich ambiguity and allusions.

42. Ishikawa (1995, 232) explains that the cult of Śākyamuni worship used the *Compassionate Flower Scripture* in conjunction with copies of the tenth century Śākyamuni Buddha statue of Seiryōji 清凉寺 in Sagano, Kyoto. For background on this statue see Henderson and Hurvitz (1956).

Chapter Four

The "Robe in Accord with the *Dharma*" in the Tokugawa Period

Introduction

In the previous chapter I discussed the development of beliefs about the *kesa* that appeared in various literary contexts beginning in the late Heian period. These texts describe the *kesa* as a garment imbued with spiritual merit, but its portrayal is strangely disembodied, with little or no reference to their color, size and material. I now turn to texts that deal with the physical aspects of *kesa*. Most of these texts were composed in the Tokugawa period by clerics from Jōdo, Tendai, Shingon, Hossō, and Zen schools who studied *vinaya* texts and the commentaries of Daoxuan, Yuanzhao, and Yijing to investigate the proper form of the *kesa* with the intention of establishing monastic purity.

The first section of this chapter deals with the political and social background of the *vinaya* reform movements that inspired much of this literature on the *kesa*. The reformers were responding in part to pressure from the government to formalize their own teachings and to use the *vinaya* regulations to control the behavior of their monks. Many studies of the *kesa* during this period were inspired by this general interest in *vinaya* reform, but in some instances attempts to determine the proper physical characteristics of the *kesa* in fact drove further inquiry into the *vinaya*.

After this general overview, I discuss three examples that demonstrate scholarly, social, and political aspects of the *kesa* studies of this period. First, an essay by Ueda Shōhen 上田正遍 (1828-1908), a Shingon *vinaya* cleric, gives us some insight into the prohibition of silk in robes. In his essay, Shōhen addresses the textual basis for the prohibition as well as practical and religious issues that it raises. His work provides valuable insights into the attitude taken by dedicated *vinaya* reformers and the impact this had on priest and lay relationships. Shōhen's work, however, addresses these problems

through a textual analysis and not from the viewpoint of a practice community.

For this aspect, I discuss the work of the Shingon cleric, Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718-1804), whose comprehensive studies of the *kesa* were put into practice by his followers. Jiun's interpretation of the color, material and shape of the *nyohō kesa* uses elements from the *Four Part Vinaya* and the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya.* Due to his willingness to combine the teachings of these two *vinaya,* Jiun's prescriptions for the robe diverged with those who focused solely on the *Four Part Vinaya.*

Jiun used the talents of his ordained and lay disciples in conveying his teachings about the robe. Famous statues and paintings of Buddhas illustrate his points in his masterwork on the *kesa.* The lay follower who drew these illustrations then produced a portrait of Jiun that followed the master's teaching about the *kesa* and became a model for subsequent portraits. Jiun also had his disciples produce *kesa* and other garments based on his research. The project of sewing one thousand *kesa* to be given to clerical followers of his *True Dharma Vinaya* (*Shōbō ritsu* 正法律) movement involved the efforts of nuns, court ladies and other laywomen. Detailed records of the project were kept over the forty years that it took to complete the one thousand robes, a demonstration of the devotion of Jiun's followers to his ideal of the *kesa* as a banner of Buddhist unity.

Finally, I introduce the work of Mokushitsu Ryōyō 黙室良要 (1775-1823), a Sōtō Zen cleric who was active among the group of scholar monks who studied and interpreted Dōgen's collected essays, the *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma*. Mokushitsu's study, *Proper Dharma Attire* (*Hōbuku kakushō* 法服格正) focuses on Dōgen's two essays, "Merit of the Kesa" and "Transmission of the Robe" (*Den'e* 傳衣) in this collection.[1] Mokushitsu's extensive use of sources produced a study that balances *vinaya* and scriptural teachings about the *kesa* with Dōgen's writings and other Zen sources. Unlike Jiun, however, Mokushitsu did not implement his ideas about the *kesa*

and his work, *Proper Dharma Attire,* stayed in handwritten copy until the end of the nineteenth century. Mokushitsu's work is revered by modern Sōtō Zen students of the *kesa,* particularly Sawaki Kōdō and Hashimoto Ekō who inherited the manuscript and published it jointly. Lectures on *Proper Dharma Attire* by these two clerics were published serially in journals during the 1930s and 1940s. These lectures in turn inspired a generation of Sōtō clerics, nuns, and lay people to begin sewing robes in a manner they refer to as *nyohō e,* the "robe according to the dharma."

Part 1. *Vinaya* Reform Movements in the Tokugawa Period

During the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries the Tokugawa government influenced and controlled relationships between Buddhist institutions, clergy, and the laity by issuing various directives (*jiin hatto* 寺院法度). Their goal was to eradicate Christian groups, to control new, potentially subversive religious groups, and to some degree, control established Buddhist institutions.[2] In response to the Shimabara rebellion of 1638 the government established parishioner registration (*danka seido* 檀家制度) that required Buddhist temples to confirm the lay membership of each temple through funeral records. This system, referred to as the *terauke* 寺請け, used Buddhist institutions to oversee the religious lives of the people.

Tamamuro (1996) identifies three distinct areas covered by the government's decrees. First, the government issued directives to the main temples of Buddhist schools, requiring them to train ordinees in the specific tenets and scriptures of their school and to expel all those who violated the rules of the *vinaya*. Second, as part of this restructuring, the Tokugawa government laid out guidelines for certifying new clergy and promoting those with seniority. The government required two years at a study center (*dangisho* 談義所) and a further three years at a main temple in order to qualify as Buddhist clergy.

Third, the government directed the Buddhist schools to set up a system of main and branch temples to clearly define hierarchical allegiances and obligations (Tamamuro 1996, 7-9). Although these directives encouraged study of Buddhist texts and teachings, they had the effect of intensifying sectarian differences. In *kesa* studies as well, the initial aspiration of wearing a robe made according to the specification of the *vinaya* as an expression of the unity of Buddhist life devolved into sectarian studies (Ueda 1976, 38). Thus, the government's tendency to strengthen sectarian identity had the effect of diverting attention away from the unifying ideal of the *nyohō kesa.*

In 1613 and 1615 the *bakufu* issued directives concerning the right to bestow the purple robe on worthy clerics (Tamamuro 1996, 12-13).[3] Until this point the gift of the purple robe had been solely the prerogative of the monarch of Japan. These two directives stated that a candidate for the honor of the purple robe must now be cleared through the *bakufu.* Not only was this an affront to the independence of the hereditary ruler, it also meant that the fees paid for the honor by the priest and his temple would now be split with the Tokugawa *bakufu* (Williams 2000, 31-32). The government thus asserted its dominance over the hereditary ruler of Japan, while acknowledging the power of the symbol of the purple robe that linked the hereditary line with the Buddhist establishment. Gomizunoo 後水尾 (r. 1611-1629) did not passively accept this usurpation of his prerogative, and he continued to bestow honorary titles and purple robes as before. But in 1627 the government issued a directive invalidating those honors which it had not approved, thus precipitating what is known as the purple robe incident (*shie jiken* 紫衣事件) This incident concerns the purple robe as a symbol of power that was manipulated by the court, the government and the Gozan temples, Daitokuji 大徳寺 and Myōshinji 妙心寺 but it tells us very little of the vast work on the meaning and form of the *kesa* by scholar-monks during this period.

It may seem from the above discussion that *vinaya* reform movements and the

many texts produced about the *kesa* during this period were under the aegis of the Tokugawa government, and were primarily politically motivated. There are indications, however, that the initial impetus for *vinaya* reform came from Buddhists themselves. Only later, as these movements expanded, did the Tokugawa government begin to utilize aspects of the movement that suited their own agenda.

Ueda Reijō (1976, 1977) argues that the earliest and most influential *vinaya* reform group was centered at Mt. Toganoō 栂尾 in western Kyoto where Myōnin 明忍 (1576-1610) and others pledged in 1603 to uphold the full two hundred and fifty precepts in a rite called self-ordination (*jisei jukai* 自誓受戒).[4] Self-ordination does not require the presence of a preceptor monk, rather, the recipient makes vows in front of a Buddha statue, after having received an auspicious sign from the Buddha. Myōnin and his companions relied on the precedent of Eison 叡尊 (1201-1290), and Kakujō 覺盛 (1193-1249) who performed self-ordination vows at Tōdaiji in 1236, and established precepts renewal movements at Saidaiji 西大寺 and Tōshōdaiji 東招提寺 respectively. These two clerics are regarded as the founders of the *vinaya* reform movement of the Kamakura period in which lay as well as priests received bodhisattva precepts.[5] Paul Groner (2005, 219) argues that Eison and Kakujō used the self-ordination rite as a one-time effort to renew the lineage of monastic regulations but they did not promote this as a practice.[6] Similarly, Myōnin and his companions considered the rite as a single event to renew the practice of monastic regulation (Ueda 1976, 25).

One of the issues not fully resolved in the Kamakura period was how the precepts were to be administered. Japanese Buddhists had developed a type of ordination in which various sets of precepts are received all at once, in the rite of comprehensive receiving of the precepts (*tsūjukai* 通受戒). In this rite the recipient agrees to uphold the three pure precepts (*sanju jōkai* 三聚淨戒) of doing no evil, promoting good and helping all beings.

According to Yogacara (Hossō 法相) doctrine, the first pure precept of doing no evil encompasses the two hundred and fifty precepts of morality and deportment of the *vinaya* as well as shorter lists used for laity, so this single ceremony held on one occasion could serve as a full ordination for monks and nuns as well as a precepts ceremony for householders. *Vinaya* texts, however, prescribe separate rites at different times for distinct sets of precepts for lay men and women, novices, probationary nuns, fully ordained monks and nuns, and bodhisattva monks. These separate ordination rites (*betsu jukai* 別受戒) required the presence of a group of ten ordained monks, including three preceptors and seven witnesses.

By the seventeenth century, the *vinaya* movement established by Eison had four lineages based in each of the four temples of Saidaiji, Tōshōdaiji, Kaidan'in 戒壇院 (of Tōdaiji 東大寺); and Sennyūji 泉涌寺 (in southeastern Kyoto). Only Tōshōdaiji preserved separate ordinations at the beginning of the Tokugawa period, which were administered only to those who were associated with the temple (Ueda 1976, 26). For Myōnin and other *vinaya* reformers in the Tokugawa period, performing the separate ordination rite would be a way to reestablish the proper ordination but their lack of connection to the Tōshōdaiji lineage denied them access to this rite.

Myōnin, who was associated with Saidaiji and therefore could not take the separate ordination, vowed to reestablish this rite in his *vinaya* reforms. He planned to go to China to receive a *vinaya* ordination lineage, but died at the age of 35 before he could go. In spite of his short life, Myōnin built a monks' training hall, Saimyōji 西明寺, at Toganoō. Soon, monks who had trained at Saimyōji established three more training centers: a separate training facility at Mt. Kōya called Shinbetsusho 真別処; and Jinbōji 神鳳寺 and Yachūji 野中寺, both in present day Osaka prefecture. Yachūji became a magnet for *vinaya* studies for clerics from the Jōdo, Tendai, Rinzai, and other Buddhist

schools. This early movement begun by Myōnin was open to all, regardless of sectarian affiliation. Indeed, Myōnin had already renounced sectarian Buddhism when he initiated his *vinaya* reform movement (Ueda 1976, 26). The ideal of the early Tokugawa *vinaya* movement, therefore, was to transcend sectarian divisions and provide the same monastic discipline for all who were ordained, regardless of differences in doctrine.

At Yachūji, a second generation dharma heir of Myōnin, Ji'nin Emyō 慈忍慧猛 (1613-1675), shaped his approach to *vinaya* which combined the scholastic and esoteric elements of *vinaya* study at Saidaiji with the more conservative approach of Tōshōdaiji. His school, referred to as the Blue Dragon group (*shōryū ha* 青竜派), combined the teachings of all four lineages of Japanese *vinaya* (i.e., Saidaiji, the southern and northern lineages, and Tōshōdaiji). Jiun, who received his training at Yachūji, was deeply influenced by this group (Okumura 2003, 70).

At the same time that Shingon *vinaya* monks promoted the ideal of the *vinaya* as a teaching that unified Buddhists under a single discipline, some teachers developed interpretations of the *vinaya* as an esoteric teaching. Jōgon 浄厳 (1639-1702), for example, used the idea of "Secret esoteric oneness of the precepts" (*himitsu sanmaya kai* 祕密三昧耶戒) to promote precepts assemblies for the laity that included the esoteric ritual of anointing (*kanjō* 灌頂) with receiving the bodhisattva precepts. By receiving the precepts in this way, the recipient made a karmic connection with the Buddha. According to records kept by his disciple, Rentai 連体 (fl. 1700), Jōgon administered these precepts to as many as 15,000 people, including the Shōgun, Tokugawa Tsunayoshi 徳川綱吉(1646-1709), and most of the Daimyō in Edo, thus creating a widespread practice that continues to this day (Ueda 1976, 28).[7]

On the one hand, Jōgon's precepts assemblies brought a great number of people to Buddhism, but his teaching about the *vinaya* binds it to the Shingon school as an esoteric

teaching of that school. Similar sectarian approaches to the *vinaya* took place in Jōdo and Zen. This tendency to develop sectarian interpretations of the *vinaya* took hold during the mid-Tokugawa period. Hence, the *vinaya* reform movement, instead of being a uniting force, devolved into separate traditions of interpretation within each of the schools.

During this period there was an explosion of scholarship about the *kesa.* Until the seventeenth century, studies of *vinaya* regulations about the *kesa* occupied a quiet backwater of Buddhist writings in the form of commentaries on Yuanzhao's *Outline of the Six Necessities.* This work, because it deals extensively with the set of three robes of the monk, served as a beginning point for serious study of the monastic rules about clothing. For example, the modern *vinaya* bibliographer, Tokuda, lists only five commentaries written during the first three hundred and fifty years after its introduction to Japan in 1246, but in the first hundred and eighty years of the Tokugawa period, from 1600 to 1778, fifty-two independent commentaries were published on this one text alone, a tenfold increase in less than half the time of the preceding period (Tokuda 1974, 105-108). Why did the *kesa* attract so much interest, and what was the effect of this scholarship?

Kawaguchi (1976, 357-358) classifies these works into four categories: first, works that continue the commentary tradition of Yuanzhao's work; second, works that continue in the tradition of state regulation of monks' clothing; third, works that focus on the description of the *kesa* in Chinese translations of the *vinaya*, reflecting the renewed interest in monastic rules; and finally, works by Sōtō Zen scholar-priests that incorporate the notion of the *kesa* as a sign of transmission. For the purpose of my research, the last two categories are the most important. From 1677 to 1884 approximately thirty five texts were produced by priests in the Shingon, Jōdo, Kegon, and Tendai sects that sought to explicate Buddhist clothing using *vinaya*, treatises and scriptural texts. For these writers, restoring the form and practice of Japanese Buddhist robes to the prescriptions of the

vinaya signalled a restoration of the monastic regulations as a whole.

In contrast, scholar monks of the Sōtō Zen school associated the "robe in accord with the *dharma*" as an emblem of transmission and awakening, deeply connected with Zen lineage mythology. The Sōtō lineage produced approximately seventeen works from 1703 to 1825 about the significance of the robe as a sign of transmission in Zen sources, focusing on Dōgen's writings on the *kesa*. Sōtō Zen writers were thus in a better position than other schools to fuse studies of the *kesa* with a study of the founder's teachings.

Many Tokugawa period works on the *kesa* explain prescriptions about the proper mode of dress in the *Four Part Vinaya*. Especially in the early Tokugawa period, *vinaya* reformers accepted Daoxuan's prohibition against silk, and exclusively wore robes of cotton and linen. Later, however, scholar-monks incorporated teachings about the *kesa* from other *vinaya*, particularly the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya*, and the travel records and commentaries of Yijing. Yijing's arguments in favor of silk, therefore, became more widely known. Because of this wider reading, Japanese scholar monks of the Tokugawa period began to grapple with the debate between Daoxuan and Yijing over the use of silk, a topic addressed in the next section.

Japanese monks who sought to implement Daoxuan's interpretation of the *Four Part Vinaya* began to wear robes made of linen that were dyed in colors of blue, black and dull grey. They avoided the use of silk which had become nearly ubiquitous as robe material. Ironically, these robes, with their dull colors and wrinkled appearance, attracted more attention as the concurrent trend toward the use of gold brocade in the surrounding Buddhist culture became more pronounced.[8] The Tokugawa *bakufu* created a new category in the government sumptuary rules based on the plain robes of *vinaya* enthusiasts. Even here the government recognized the sectarian interpretation of the rules for *kesa*. For example, fascicle one in *Ranks of all Buddhists* (*Shoshū kaikyū* 諸宗階級)

indicates these different approaches, commenting that the Tendai Anraku *vinaya* monks wore only grey robes of cotton or linen, Shingon *vinaya* monks avoided silk as well as purple and scarlet robes, and Jōdo monks, although allowing silk, prohibited figured silk (ZZGR 12.365b; 389a; and 369b respectively).[9] In the next section Shōhen's essay shows the kinds of issues that were raised when Tokugawa *vinaya* monks rejected silk. Although written in the early Meiji period, this work fully discusses the ethical and practical problems of the practice and shows the potential effect on monastic and lay relations.

Part 2. Ueda Shōhen and the Prohibition against Silk *Kesa*

Ueda Shōhen was born in 1828 in present day Tokushima prefecture. He received the tonsure in 1842 at the age of fourteen and received Shingon initiations and training for the next four years, including the study of Siddham characters (Sanskrit) on Mt. Kōya. In 1847 he studied Kegon teachings at Shōbōji-in 生玉持院 in Osaka, and in 1854 he studied Tendai meditation at Miidera 三井寺, in Ōmi, Shiga prefecture. In 1856, at the age of twenty-eight, Shōhen took a personal vow to uphold the precepts. The following day he received the full two hundred and fifty precepts at Enmyōji, the temple where Jōgon had established the combination of esoteric and *vinaya* teachings discussed above. Shōhen later became head priest of Enmyōji.

In 1880 Shōhen wrote *Arguments for the Southern Mountain Vinaya School Prohibition of Silk Kesa* (*Nanzan risshū kesa kinken junshō ron* 南山律宗袈裟禁絹順正論, DNB 74.303-310; hereafter *Prohibition of Silk Kesa*). Shōhen considers the main points of the debate of whether silk is appropriate for Buddhist robes. He discusses the textual evidence for the abstract moral principle of the anti-silk position from the perspective of one who has incorporated this position in his own religious practice. *Prohibition of Silk Kesa* is written as a question and answer dialogue between a cleric and

a lay believer. Several times Shōhen comments that he is merely presenting the facts of the debate, and that one must make up one's own mind:

> [Layman's] Question: I have undertaken to read the citations from the teachings of both teachers [Daoxuan and Yijing] again and again. The implications are very detailed. It is difficult to clarify the good and the bad immediately. So I ask you to make a judgement.
>
> [Shōhen's] Answer: The two teachers' explanations are like Spring orchids and Autumn chrysanthemums; both are beautiful, so choose as you will for your own practice, relying on the explanation that you can trust. As for me, I am in Daoxuan's lineage, so I deeply believe in his explanation. I now will try to reconcile the criticisms of other lineages.
>
> 問。両師ノ説文引示ヲ蒙ル。数々之ヲ讀ム。義趣甚ハダ精細。其ノ是非輒暁シテ難シ。請フ半決セム。
>
> 答。両師ノ説。春蘭秋菊其ノ美ヲ擅ニス。故に行セバ己可信ノ説ヲ依可乎。予ガ如キハ終南ノ末葉。深ク終南祖説ヲ信ス。他家ノ 妨難ヲ至ラハ。
> (DNB 74.305a).

Here, Shōhen suggests that one must make up one's own mind based on the evidence, but he indicates that his own choice was made on the basis of loyalty to his lineage. In the following discussion I have chosen three passages from his essay that address the affect of the prohibition against silk on lay-monastic relations.

In the first selection of *Prohibition of Silk Kesa*, Shōhen quotes a precedent in the *Four Part Vinaya* that prohibited silk for a reclining mat (*gagu* 臥具). The Buddha's disciples have asked for a decision about various violations made by the gang of six (bad) monks. The incident involving the sleeping mat is reported to the Buddha as follows:

> At that time of upheaval, those ruffians made it with silk. The householders saw it and they were quite critical, saying that the disciples of Śākyamuni have no shame about harming living beings. On hearing of this, others said that "our practice is the true way, how can that be the true way?" To seek for silk to make a new reclining mat is to be criticized as in the above event. All bhikṣus hear this!
>
> 彼暴繭時蠶蛹作聲。諸居士見盡共譏嫌言。沙門釋子無有慚愧害衆生命。外自稱言。我修正法。如是何有正法。求索蠶繭作新臥具。以如上事呵責。諸比丘聞。(fasc. 7, T 22.614a)

This *vinaya* passage raises two public relations problems brought on by the actions of the bad monks. First, the laity will criticize followers of Śākyamuni for not feeling shame at harming living beings, and second, followers of other teachers, presumably the Jain, who meticulously avoid harming all life, will declare that their own teaching is superior. That is, the immediate threat is that the Buddhist order will appear to outsiders as lacking in compassion. The last line, however, addresses an internal matter. Deliberately seeking for a particular kind of fabric for a new reclining mat is seen as the cause of criticism, perhaps because it violates the rule of "few wants, knowledge of sufficiency."[10] The complaint is that these bad monks have special-ordered a nice new silk mat. As if to emphasize this internal perspective, the subsequent discussion in the *vinaya* repeatedly refers to the incident as "the group of six monks sought silk to make a new reclining mat." The case is as much about having a new one made as it is about looking for silk to make it.

Rather than analyze the specific features of the case, however, Shōhen uses it to discuss the difference between the Mahāyāna and what he termed "inferior" (*hīnayāna*) approaches to *vinaya* regulations. Focusing only on the two external criticisms, Shōhen comments:

The Buddha stops criticism and all is decided in that rule. You should know that the origin of the rule does not just apply to receiving by begging, it prohibits second-hand giving [of silk]. You can say that the Mahāyāna and the inferior vehicle are the same, but the inferior precepts stop criticism from society, whereas the Mahāyāna is established for the sake of the hindrances in compassionate practice. The matter is the same, but the intent is different. You must investigate and think about this.

佛訶責シ已リテ。乃チ彼戒ノ結ヤト。知應。彼戒縁唯乞得邊ニ之ヲ制スルノニ非。亦轉來ヲ禁ス。謂可大小同事ナルト矣。然ルニ小乗ハ息世譏嫌戒為ニ制ス。大乗ハ慈行ノ障為ルニ制ス事同ク而モ意趣別。察不可不。思不可不。(DNB 74.308a).

In his comments, Shōhen suggests that if one avoids wearing silk in order to stop other's criticism, it is an inferior type of morality based on a fear of public censure. In contrast, the Mahāyāna approach, he argues, is a positive act that promotes compassionate practice. His argument implies that a responsive relationship between lay and monastic is not an expression of compassionate practice. Only the Mahāyāna is the source of true compassion. This brings up a vital question for Shōhen and other *vinaya* reformers: how does one interpret *vinaya* rules so that the Mahāyāna meaning of the rule becomes clear? Shōhen later implies that the Mahāyāna understanding of the precepts focuses on individual moral compass more than it does on relations between monk and lay, or between the monks themselves. If silk is used, Shōhen argues, then one's practice of compassion weakens. This interpretation shifts the attention away from the relationship between the monks and laity and towards the individual.

The second selection in *Prohibition of Silk Kesa* discusses the process of making silk which involves killing silkworms to harvest the silk before the insect breaks open its

cocoon, thereby cutting through the silk fibers.[11] The layman quotes Yijing's arguments about the intentionality of killing:

> In general, if one discusses killing, first there is the intention of cutting off a life. This is just how karmic action is completed. If it is not at all intentional then it is not a sin. Three conditions must be met: intention, action and the result. If these three aspects are in accord with the monastic rules then there is no fault.
>
> 凡ソ殺ヲ論セバ。先キニ故意シテ以テ彼ノ命根ヲ斷スル。方ニ業道成ス。必故思匪レバ。佛言玉へリ犯無。三處清浄ナラバ。判シテ愆無ニ。(DNB 74.305a; T 54.212c).

Yijing's argument is that a violation of the *vinaya* does not occur if one did not have the intention to kill. The Buddhist monk may therefore receive food and clothing that involve the taking of life as long as he did not initiate the killing. As we saw with the previous quote about having a new reclining mat made out of silk, the problem is that the monk's intention to have a new one would initiate a process that involved killing to make the silk.

Shōhen sweeps away Yijing's arguments about the necessity of intention, action and result by establishing a new premise that using silk supports a whole ecology of action and intent:

> It is not unreasonable that Yijing has talked like this because some *vinaya* allow silk, so one must receive and use it. How can those who deeply value compassion, however, covet and wear the silk that causes this harm? If one wears it then one desires it and this crushes one's compassion and increases one's bad karma. If I wear silk, then that will increase harm [to living beings] by making silk. If I do not wear it then the killing will end. That sin and merit starts with me.

謂ノ[義]浄所言ノ如キ理趣無ニ非ス。故ニ有律ニ許シテ受用セ令ム。然ルニ慈悲深重ノ者。何ソ此害命ノ絹ヲ得貪服スル。若シ服スルキハ此ヲ貪服スル。則慈悲ヲ壊シ業分ニ沾フ。亦我ト絹衣ヲ服ス故ニ彼レ益害命絹ヲ作ル。若シ我服セ不キハ則彼レシテ殺ヲ斷セ。彼ノ罪福於我ヨリ起。(DNB 74.305b).

In this passage Shōhen answers Yijing by arguing that even receiving second hand silk contributes indirectly to the overall economy of silk production. He again emphasizes an internalized conception of the guidelines for compassionate behavior that allows one to interpret the *vinaya*. Even if the rules of the *vinaya* allow it, one must take the extra step of a stricter practice for the sake of one's own compassionate practice.

In the third selection in *Prohibition of Silk Kesa*, Shōhen considers the problem of receiving donations of silk. First, the layman cites Yijing's protocol, which is to accept the offering from the donor, thanking them graciously:

> If a donor brings an offering with a pure mind then recite a benediction, and accept it, saying, 'This sustains me and nurtures your virtue." Truly this is no fault.
>
> 若シ施主浄意ニシテ持チ來ル有ヲバ。即チ隨喜ヲ唱ベテ之ヲ受ケ身資テ而徳ヲ育フ須ク。實ニ過無キ也。 (DNB 74.305a; T 54.212c).

Shōhen's reply addresses the lay-monk relationship. One solution, he says, is to make an opportunity for teaching the laity about the practice of compassion. One can then have them exchange the cloth for cotton or linen (DNB 74.306a). Another solution is the complete destruction not only of the object but of the fabric as well. In the beginning of

the essay and several times later Shōhen cites a method that Daoxuan recommends in *Vinaya Revelations*. In this case, Daoxuan would interpret the term *gagu* as a set of robes:

> Reading the *vinaya*, I [Daoxuan] saw that if one receives a silk robe, one should crush it up and mix it up with hard soil to daub on the wall. By this means I doubled my reverence for the rules of the *vinaya*.
>
> 聽律ノ後及テ。便チ蠶衣臥具。縦ヒ已成ヲ得テ並ニ 斬壞シテ埵ニ 塗シ戸と事ヲ見ル。此ニ由テ重テ景仰ヲ增ス。(DNB 74.304b; T 45.879c).[12]

In Daoxuan's lineage, material contaminated by even one thread of silk must be destroyed, thereby prohibiting even the use of silk thread in sewing the garments. This is striking, because, after all, the object was presumably donated in good faith by a lay person. This argument emphatically rejects permission granted in all *vinaya* that one may use goods that involved the taking of life as long as one did not order the killing oneself. The original passage in the *Four Part Vinaya* refers to the destruction of silk reclining mats, whether one incurred a violation by having a new one made out of silk or whether one blamelessly receives one that had already been made up. According to the *Four Part Vinaya* a silk item must be destroyed by shredding it, mixing it with soil and plastering it on a wall or in a mound of earth. As Shōhen presents it, the question is how to handle inappropriate materials that were donated by the laity. Shōhen appears to take the position that the act of giving does not purify the object of its association with killing. If the object belongs to a category of forbidden materials, then one must destroy it after receiving it.

Toward the end of *Prohibition of Silk Kesa*, Shōhen sums up the mental world evoked by a Mahāyāna bodhisattva monk. Citing Daoxuan, Shōhen describes the bodhisattva as one who is able to imagine the whole chain of relationships that lie behind

the presence of the object:

> A bodhisattva imagines that which comes from afar. Even if one is removed from the act of killing, one is not without the action of killing. Stepping with the foot or wearing things on the body, one is drenched with karma.
>
> 菩薩ハ遠來處ヲ推フ。殺手ヲ離シト雖。殺業ニ非無。足ニ踏ミ身ニ披ル。皆ト業分沾。(DNB 74.309b).

In Shōhen's view, the encompassing vision of the bodhisattva makes it impossible to ignore the fact that silk depends on the death of many animals and perpetuates an inescapably linked chain of harmful deeds.

In these three examples Shōhen takes the position that the practitioner of the Mahāyāna must consider the broader implications of a rule. In the first example we saw that Shōhen's idea of the bodhisattva is one who is less concerned with what others think of him, and more concerned with his own inner practice. In the second example, he describes the desire for silk as a hindrance to compassion, but here the laity play no role at all, rather, the question of whether to use silk or not is depicted as an inner conflict, as if one had a choice, independent of the laity's donations. The Mahāyāna monk should be concerned with how his own actions contribute to a whole world of production that harms other living beings. In the third example, the Mahāyāna monk, in dealing with donations from the laity, adheres to an inner standard that requires him to ruthlessly destroy even the donation made in good faith. In conclusion, Shōhen's essay raises the question of the significance for Tokugawa period monks of following Daoxuan's prohibition of silk robes when doing so diminishes vital elements of the relationship between the laity and the monk. The picture of the bodhisattva that emerges from this essay is one who is less involved with the world in the sense that he can ignore the opinions of others, but more engaged in the sense that he can imagine the ramifications of his own and others' actions.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century a reaction against the anti-silk *vinaya* proponents set in. Dōkō 道光 (f. 1762) complained in his *Shining Deportment of Silk Robes* (*Kaie kōgi* 繪衣光儀) written in 1762 that some monks exaggerated Daoxuan's prohibition of silk to include flags, covers and other decorative utensils. He commented that because linen is shabby it is disrespectful to others, so one should use silk (DNB 73.428; Nishimura 2003b, 53).[13] Dōkō's argument that one should wear silk robes out of respect to the laity is an argument that is still repeated in contemporary Japan.

In another example, the Jōdo monk, Kyōju 敬首 (1683-1748) portrayed the *vinaya* reformers as extremists, commenting,

> When the *vinaya* monks merely hear the words, "prohibition against silk," they arbitrarily expand the explanation to include underwear and hats and so on and say that others must follow their example. When they see other *vinaya* monks who use silk they lower their brows, shake their heads and criticize them, calling them "worldly monks." Just like heretics, these guys who prohibit silk spread misery through the world by saying that no one is doing it properly. Even if you say they are encouraging frugality by wearing linen and cotton, no one reproaches them. Their good reputation is based only on the fact that they are wearing cotton so they mislead ordinary people. Recently I heard that there are those who even think that silk should be eliminated from the [cloth] covers of the three treasures. Debates about the disruptive severity of their contempt for the holy are endless.
>
> 律師と称する者が「禁絹止」という言葉のみを聞いて勝手に拡大解釈し、法衣のみならず下着や帽子等に至まで綿. 麻のみにして、律僧たるものこれに倣うわなくてはいけないと言う。法衣以外のものには絹を用いる律僧を見ると、彼らは眉をひそめ首を振って、俗僧であると決めつけて非難する。外道と同じこれら禁絹の輩は、世間に蔓延し禍をまき散らしてが、誰

も正そうとしない、というのである。さらに、律僧が木綿．麻を着て質素倹約に励んでいると言えば、誰も咎めようがないものだから、綿のみを着ることで得た良い評価に乗じて、俗人を惑わし従わせている。最近では三寶に絹を懸けることまで廃止する者が居ると聞くが、その聖をなみし法をみだす酷さは論ずるに耐えない。 (Nishimura 2003b, 53).[14]

Kyōju's description of the *vinaya* monks as narrow, severe, and judgmental presents a very different picture from Shōhen's ascetic portrait of the sensitive and intelligent bodhisattva who refuses to wear silk because he understands the endless suffering that making silk entails. Kyōju's reaction suggests that the *vinaya* monks, far from being a small withdrawn group of specialists were actually succeeding in challenging some of the basic premises of Buddhist dress in Japan. I now turn to Jiun, a scholar-priest of the eighteenth century who was prominent in the movement to reform Buddhists garments in Japan not only for the monks, but also as a focus of religious faith among the laity.

Part 3. Jiun and the *Kesa* in the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement

Although a cleric of the *Shingon risshu* 眞言律宗 school that emphasized monastic regulations, Jiun's training was quite broad.[15] As a young man, Jiun studied Neo-Confucian ideas and had little regard for Buddhism. Jiun's parents, however, were close to the Shingon *vinaya* master, Kōzen Fushō 洪善普摂 (d. 1724) who, although originally a Sōtō Zen monk, had become concerned about moral standards of the clergy and had decided to study *vinaya* with Ji'nin at Yachūji. Kōzen later rebuilt the Osaka temple, Hōrakuji 法楽寺, as a center for *vinaya*. Jiun's father's dying wish that his son be ordained into the Buddhist clergy brought Jiun reluctantly to Buddhism, and he received the tonsure in 1730 from Kōzen's disciple, Ninkō Teiki 忍綱貞紀 (fl. 1720-1750). The calm, gentle demeanor and modest habits of Teiki, who wore only linen robes, made a

favorable impression on the teenage Jiun. Jiun studied with Teiki until the age of sixteen, when Teiki sent him to study Confucianism at the school founded by the Confucian classicist, Itō Jinsei 伊藤仁斎 (1627-1705). Itō's teaching, called the study of ancient meanings (*kogi gaku* 古義学), promoted reading the original texts directly rather than relying on commentaries, a pedagogical model whose influence can be seen in Jiun's later works. After three years Jiun returned to Hōrakuji to tend to the ailing Teiki.

In 1736, at the age of 19, Jiun began formal training at Yachūji, and received the novice precepts (JSZ 0.191). Thirty years later during a lecture, Jiun reported that during this first year at Yachūji he was deeply impressed by the experience of seeing the original works of the *Four Part Vinaya* and for the first time produced the thought of enlightenment, an experience which he likens to awakening the great mind of Samantabhadra (JSZ 0.191-192).[16] During this first year Jiun also began his practice of meditation. Two years later, he received the full two hundred and fifty precepts along with other initiations from Teiki. Jiun's ordinations, therefore, were separate (*betsujukai*). At the age of 22, Jiun received transmission of the Dharma from Teiki, reaching the rank of *ajari* 阿闍梨, which qualified him as a Shingon master in the Saidaiji lineage.

In 1739, just three years after Jiun began his training at Yachūji, Teiki gave him the responsibility of leading Hōrakuji. After two years, however, Jiun, now 24 years old, decided to leave Hōrakuji in the care of his own student so that he could go to Shōanji 正安寺 in Shinshū 信州 to study meditation with the Sōtō Zen cleric, Hōsen Daibai 法寿大梅 (1682-1757). Jiun remained at Shōanji for two years until 1743 when he returned to Hōrakuji. Although very little is written about these two years with Hōsen, it left a lasting impression. Jiun records that in his second year at Shōanji for the first time he felt right; in balance and at peace.[17] Throughout his life Jiun continued to have a high regard for Sōtō style of meditation and often recommended it to his lay disciples.

In 1749 Jiun wrote *Basic Regulations for Monks* (*Konpon Sōsei* 根本僧制; JSZ 6) in order to revive what he referred to as the true teaching and practice of the Buddhist way, thus initiating his movement called the *True Dharma Vinaya* (*Shōbōritsu* 正法律). In *Basic Regulations for Monks* Jiun established a hierarchy for solving problems in Buddhist practice: one begins with the *vinaya* as the first and highest authority. If the *vinaya* is silent on the question, then one may consult scriptures and commentaries. Last, if these resources have been exhausted, the instructions of past teachers and the advice of the community of monks may decide the question (JSZ 6.70-75; Watt 1982, 87). Jiun declared that there would be no sectarian obstacle to following this movement, and that clerics of other schools were welcome to join.

In 1750, one year after setting up the rules for his *True Dharma Vinaya* movement, Jiun began a series of lectures on the Buddhist robe at Keirinji 桂林寺 in Arima 有馬 (in present-day Hyōgo prefecture), using as his base text *Compilation of the Proper Deportment of Buddhist Robes* (*Butsumon efuku shōgihen* 佛門衣服正儀編, DNB 73.143-230), a 1717 composition with accompanying illustrations by the learned Kegon cleric, Hōtan 鳳潭 (1654-1738). In this work, Hōtan argued that the form of Buddhist garments in China and Japan violates monastic regulations.[18] Jiun's lectures were compiled in 1750 under the title, *Critique of Compilation of the Proper Deportment of Buddhist Robes* (*Butsumon ebuku shōgihen hyōshaku* 佛門衣服正儀篇評釈; JSZ 3.1-305). Over the next eight years Jiun produced three major works on the Buddhist robe, beginning with *Illustrated Standard of Garments of the Way* (*Hōbuku zugi* 方服圖儀; abridged, *ryakuhon* 略本, JSZ 1.1-83; full-length, *kōhon* 廣本, JSZ 1.87-324, hereafter *Garments of the Way*), completed in 1751.[19] *Garments of the Way* is an extensive study of the *kesa* as described in the *vinaya*, scriptures and commentaries, for which Jiun provided both an abridged and full length format. For the next eight years Jiun continued to lecture on this topic. In 1759 at the age of 45, Jiun published the twelve

fascicle *Lectures on the Inner Meaning of Illustrated Standard of Garments of the Way* (*Hōbuku zugi kōge* 方服圖儀講解玄談; JSZ 2.1-504, hereafter, *Inner Meaning*) which provided annotation and discussion for the principle topics of *Garments of the Way*. These two works and their commentary provide considerable information and interpretation of the meaning and physical form of Buddhist garments.

In addition to these major works on the *kesa*, Jiun did three smaller studies. In 1756 Jiun was invited to view Hōryūji's treasures at Shitennōji, including the Prince Shōtoku *kesa*. Jiun wrote *Record of the Investigation of the Prince Shōtoku Kesa* (*Shōtoku Taishi kesa kenshōki* 聖德太子袈裟驗證記; JSZ 1.329-339, hereafter *Shōtoku Kesa*) to record his findings. Two years later, in 1758, Jiun wrote *Essential Features of Monastic Attire According to the Mūlasarvāstivada* (*Konpon setsu issai ubu esō ryakuyō* 根本説一切有部衣相略要; JSZ 3.307-339), thus demonstrating his knowledge of the *kesa* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya* as well as in the *Four Part Vinaya*.[20] A shorter work, *Verses in Praise of Garments of the Way* (*Hōbuku kasan* 方服歌讃; JSZ 1.341-354), condenses Jiun's teachings on the robe into seventy verses, and serves as a primer for the rules and structure of the *kesa*. It was this book of verses that two nuns in Jiun's lineage gave to Sawaki Kōdō, introducing him to the possibilities of research on the Buddhist robe. In the modern printed edition, Jiun's works on the *kesa* comprise six hundred eighty-four pages, most of it quite dense, but with sections of nearly full page illustrations of Buddhist statues, *kesa*, sewing methods and construction, dye plants, sewing rulers and so on.

The title of *Garments of the Way* introduces the unusual compound, *hōfuku* 方服. In translating the title, I am following Jiun's own commentary in *Inner Meaning* (see discussion on the title below). To my knowledge, no modern scholar discusses Jiun's use of the unusual compound, *hōbuku* 方服. The term is rare in works before Daoxuan, who uses it infrequently and without explanation.[21] Contemporary Sōtō Zen *kesa* sewing

groups interpret the term to mean "rectangular robe," giving a literal rendering of *hō* 方 as "rectangular" ("hōfuku" in ZGD 1141a).[22] According to this definition, the title could be rendered *Foursquare Robe*, which would indicate both the physical form of four right angles as well as the religious sense of being according to a rule or standard of rightness. This is not, however, how Jiun chooses to parse his own title. Jiun explains his choice of terminology as a way to simultaneously refer to the rightness or proper aspect (*hō* 方) of the garments as well as the activity implied by making, wearing and using them according to the rules, which, like the farmer rooting out weeds in his field, purifies the monk:

> Also, *hōfuku* is a name for *kesa* garments. There are many names for *kesa* garments...The expression *hōfuku* includes two meanings: a method of cultivating, and correct according to the dharma. If I say dharma clothing then it means rule and is not thoroughgoing. Garments of the way highlights [both meanings]. First, in deportment, rules mean the way of cultivating. Second, because of the Honored One, the way means both dharma and correctness.
>
> 又方服者袈裟衣ヲ名ク。袈裟衣名多シ。。。又方服ノ言ハ憂方ト法正トノ二義ヲ含ム。若シ法服ト言ハ則義ヲ攝盡キ不。故に方服ト標ス也。一二儀相ニ就ハ則方是レ憂方の義。二ニ尊尚ニ依ハ。則方ハ亦法也正也。(JSZ 2.97-98).

Jiun argues that his choice of the name "garments of the way," over the more common term, "dharma garment" (*hōfuku* 法服) emphasizes that the Buddhist robe involves not only knowing the teachings regarding the robe, but also engaging in the consistent practice of cultivation that they require. The word itself indicates both mental and a physical discipline.

In this work Jiun explains that he uses *hōbuku* as a category term for the set of

three robes of the monk.[23] Jiun's may have decided to use this name for the three robes in order to avoid the problems of category terms for the three robes. As we saw in the preceding section, Daoxuan's problematic translation of *gagu* as a set of three robes was disputed by Yijing. Jiun, however, is also reluctant to follow Yijing's recommendation that the proper category term for three robes is *civara* (*shibara* 支伐羅).[24] Instead, he takes a virtually unknown name, elevates it to the status of a category name for the three robes, and then tells us what it means.

Abbreviated *Garments of the Way* is divided into eight chapters: (1) Recommendation for precepts (*kankai* 勸戒); (2) Superior merit (*shōtoku* 勝德); (3) Meaning of names (*nagi* 名義); (4) Construction (*seien* 制縁); (5) Proper form (*shōgi* 正儀); (6) Textual proofs (*shōbun* 證文); (7) Critique of disputes (*seppi* 斥非); and (8) Question and answer (*mondō* 問答). In the first chapter Jiun exhorts the reader that now is the time to take up the discipline of the Buddha:

> Two thousand seven hundred years after the nirvana of the Buddha, the wisdom of the Ārya is submerged and Māra and heretics flourish. We honor and respect the law set up by the Buddha whose teaching was transmitted to China and Japan. Shouldn't we be led by this teaching? I proclaim that this is the time for us to know how to follow and act on this teaching.
>
> 佛陀滅後二千七百年、賢聖湮没し魔外勃興す。支那日本の傳教、其ノ佛の製スル所ヲ尊奉スルナリ或ハ鮮。豈啻ニ其ノ所ノ制ニ導セズノミナランヤ。動ずれば随方知る時と称する。嗚呼、如来三達智の所を照らし、故に不通澆末の制を作して、而して後人凡愚の改張を俟つ有んや。 (JSZ 1.1).

Jiun sees evidence of the degeneration of the Buddha's teaching as an imperative to follow the teachings of the *vinaya*, not as an excuse to abandon the practice. He understands it as a matter of knowledge and action, of individual and collective effort to

understand the teachings of the Buddha.

In the following section on the merit of the *kesa* Jiun argues that Buddhist robes demonstrate the indivisibility of phenomena and principle:

> When phenomena and principle are attained and merged, then the aspects of cause and result become one reality. If one stands within this [merging of] phenomena and principle, then one sees the Dharma world in every dust mote. For this reason the marvelously deep and pure Dharma body has forty-eight superior qualities. The special body of Vairocana wears the nine by six [measure] robe of the way, and this robe of the way penetrates everywhere. It becomes the great sign of the wise renunciate and is the banner of liberation from the world.
>
> 未れ事理を得て融するきには、則ち因果相即して同一実相なり。理事の如にして立するときんば　則ち一一塵中に法界を見る。故に徴妙淨法身四八の勝相を具し。遮那尊特の體九六の方服を被す。維れ此の方服は十法該通して、賢聖沙門の大標と為り出離解脱の幢相と為る。(JSZ 1.5).[25]

In this explanation Jiun refers to the doctrine from the *Avataṃsaka sūtra* that "In every speck of dust the Buddha establishes a place of practice/ Where He enlightens every being and displays spiritual wonders" (translation by Tanabe in DeBary 2001, 110; T 10.22). The image of rays of light spreading out from the figure of Vairocana, with a dharma world at the end of each ray provided important imagery for an ideology aimed at unifying the central government with the provinces of the eighth century Japanese state. Jiun explains that the intention to understand every dust mote as a *dharma* world and the realization of this intention brings about the intention and realization of Vairocana who wears the garment of the way. By linking the *kesa* with Vairocana, Jiun taps into this deep historical connection between Buddhist thought and state ideology in Japan. The garment of the way, therefore, is the embodiment of a Buddhist world in which

phenomena and principle merge.

A important aspect of Jiun's approach is his use of drawings in the fifth chapter of the abbreviated *Garments of the Way* to discuss how the *kesa* is made and worn (JSZ 1.12-35). The chapter is divided into three major sections, with the illustrations and their explanations occupying the first and second sections. Jiun first provides schematic drawings of the three types of robes and the manner of construction, with accompanying inscriptions. This includes illustrations for stitch patterns described in the *vinaya* as horse tooth stitch (*meshi* 馬歯); two forms of bird foot stitch (*toriashi* 鳥足); and bookbinder stitch (*henyō hen* 編葉邊). For the two upper robes he provides instructions for both rag robes and monastic robes, including the number of layers of cloth. The cloth ties (*kōchū* 鉤紐) are carefully identified and illustrated as well. Even in the brief explanations accompanying the drawings, Jiun is careful to distinguish between traditional methods and his own innovations. For example, in identifying the different kinds of stitches above, Jiun mentions that the horse tooth stitch is according to traditional drawings, but that his illustration for the bookbinder stitch sets a precedent. After this first section of illustrations, Jiun discusses appropriate materials, receiving and handling materials, color and dyeing, measurements, the number of panels for each type of robe and the divisions within each panel, the number of layers and method of piecing the sections, the borders and reinforcing squares for each of the four corners, the design and placement of the ties, and methods of sewing and time limits for each of the robes.

In the second section of this chapter, Jiun discusses how the *kesa* is to be worn, using famous Japanese Buddhist sculptures and paintings to support his points (JSZ 1.22-28). He divides these into two categories: first, Buddha figures, including Śākyamuni Buddha, Ratnakūṭa and Amitābha (Amida); and second, eminent teachers, including Nāgārjuna, Bodhidharma and Ganjin. Jiun begins with four illustrations of

Buddha statues in Japan that show various modes of how the Buddha wears the *kesa*: (1) the Chinese standing Śākyamuni Buddha statue at Seiryōji 清凉寺 in western Kyōto; (2) the Japanese standing Amitābha (Amida) Buddha from Zenkōji 善光寺 in Shinshū 信州 (known as Shinano 信濃 to Jiun); (3) Ratnakūṭa (*Hōdō nyorai* 寶幢), who represents the awakening of *bodhi* mind in the Maṇḍala of the Womb World (*Taizō kai mandara* 胎藏界曼荼羅); and (4) Amitābha (Amida) Buddha welcoming (beings) to the Pure Land (*anyō hensō raigō nyorai* 安養変相來迎如来) that is depicted in the Taimadera Mandara 當麻寺曼荼羅. These drawings appear only in the abbreviated *Garments of the Way* and in this work Jiun limits his discussion to how the garments on the statues are depicted.[26] Jiun discusses the history and importance of these cultural icons in the corresponding sections of *Inner Meaning* (JSZ 2.244-256).

The first two statues, the Seiryōji Śākyamuni Buddha and the Zenkōji Amida Buddha are regarded as having been transmitted across three kingdoms (*sangoku denrai* 三國傳來): India, China and Japan in the case of the Seiryōji Buddha, and India, Paekche and Japan in the case of the Zenkōji Buddha.[27] In addition, both statues are regarded as a "Living Buddha" (McCallum 1994, 170). For Jiun, their status as ancient icons provides them with sufficient authority for establishing the proper manner of wearing the *kesa*. In his autocommentary, Jiun discusses the notion that the carving of the original statue was a divinely guided act, and lists the different copies that were made of the statue and the special characteristics of each copy (JSZ 2.245). Another factor in Jiun's choice of these figures may be the popularity of the religious cults associated with them. Both Buddha statues traveled to other parts of Japan in traveling exhibits, as did the Hōryūji Shōtoku *kesa* discussed in chapter two.[28] Jiun comments on the problems of relying on copies of statues without being able to see them and study them first hand, and carefully documents his doubts and speculations (JSZ 2.247).[29]

These first two Buddha images demonstrate the manner of wearing the *kesa* over both shoulders (*tsūken* 通肩). This method requires the *kesa* to be tied in front of the body, according to Jiun's analysis. The double shoulder draping of the *kesa* is reserved for the great *kesa* of more than nine panels. In art, the double shoulder method is used to depict the Buddha and other eminent teachers. In contrast, the usual manner of wearing the *kesa* is to drape it over the left shoulder, leaving the right shoulder bare (*hendan uken* 偏袒右肩). Looking at the two figures, one wonders why Jiun chose to represent the double shoulder draping of the *kesa* with two statues rather than one. Was it simply because both images were so venerated in Japan? Reading the text, however, Jiun's purpose becomes clear: although both the Seiryōji and the Zenkōji Buddhas wear the *kesa* draped over both shoulders, the hem of the *kesa* in the front of the body is portrayed differently in the two statues.

In the Seiryōji Śākyamuni Buddha statue, the edge of the *kesa* is parallel with the ground (JSZ 1.22), whereas in the Zenkōji Amida Buddha statue, one corner of the *kesa*, shaped like a downward pointing triangle, hangs down in front of the body (JSZ 1.23). Why are they different? After considering a number of explanations, Jiun concludes that the difference in the portrayal of the hem of the *kesa* was to distinguish statues of Śākyamuni and Amida respectively. As evidence he cites both the *Scripture of the Questions of Śāriputra* and Yijing's *Record of the Southern Seas* (JSZ 2.247). Thus, Jiun's choice of these two statues is not only because they were highly regarded as living Buddhas. Rather, for Jiun these two statues present a problem in the interpretation of how the *kesa* is worn and how it is depicted in art, a problem that he feels compelled to solve. His faith in the intentionality of the artists is also noteworthy, suggesting that Jiun ascribed considerable authority to these works.

Drawings three and four present a different problem. This time, the focus is on the manner of holding the corners of the *kesa* in the left hand with the surplus cloth

wrapped around the arm. The third illustration of Ratnakūṭa likely refers to a copy of the Maṇḍala of the Two Worlds that Kūkai brought to Japan from China in the ninth century (JSZ 2.248). In the Womb World Maṇḍala the image of Ratnakūṭa Buddha is positioned above Vairocana, his right arm held open to the viewer with the palm facing outwards in a teaching gesture. The left arm is wrapped in his red robe, the back of the hand facing the viewer, with the hand closed in a grip (Ten Grotenhuis 1999, plate 9). It is difficult to be certain of details in the color reproduction, but comparing it with the drawing in *Garments of the Way*, one can see the similarity in the position of the two arms, the arrangement of the robes, and the position of the feet (JSZ 1.24). Similarly, the drawing in *Garments of the Way* represents the figure in a seated posture, with the *kesa* draped over the left shoulder. The right hand is in a teaching gesture and the left hand grips two corners of the *kesa* which stand up like rabbit ears.

The Amida image of the fourth drawing in Jiun's explanation is from the lower right section of the *Taima Mandara* where Amida stands and welcomes beings to the Pure Land (Ten Grotenhuis 1999, 17; figure 4). Jiun uses this drawing to demonstrate both the double shoulder draping as well as the mode of holding the corners of the upper and lower corners of the left side of the *kesa* gathered into the left hand (JSZ 1.25). The corners of the *kesa* in the left hand droop in a circular pattern rather than standing up as in the third figure above. Although there is little accompanying text, these two illustrations demonstrate that holding the ends of the *kesa* in this manner occurs in both standing or seated Buddha figures, regardless of whether the *kesa* is worn over both or only one shoulder. It is used in portrayals of different Buddhas and is a style that may occur in different situations.[30] Jiun discusses the manner of holding the corners of the *kesa* in the left hand in detail in the section on the four postures of the monk that follows.

Next, Jiun shows different ways of wearing the *kesa* as illustrated by three drawings of eminent masters.[31] First, he illustrates Nāgārjuna in a seated posture with

the *kesa* worn over the left shoulder, his left hand grasping the two corners of the left side of the *kesa* (JSZ 1.26). Jiun identifies the garment as a strip-seam *kesa*, and uses this illustration to continue his discussion of the left hand grasping the *kesa*. The second illustration is of Bodhidharma facing the wall (*menpeki* 面壁), wearing the *kesa* over his head in the cold of the night (JSZ 1.27). Rikyō has signed this drawing, suggesting that it is his own rendition of Bodhidharma in this posture. Third, Jiun illustrates the portrait statue of Ganjin previously discussed in chapter two (JSZ 1.28). The illustration does not, however, highlight the attached *kesa* on the statue. Rather, Jiun is concerned with how the *kesa* appears on the statue from the front, with the extra fabric of the *kesa* thrown over the left shoulder. Of this series of Buddhas and eminent teachers, this drawing is the only one that plainly shows a Chinese style under-robe with sleeves. Jiun raises important issues in the evolution of Buddhist garments by including these illustrations of eminent masters.

In the next section, Jiun explains the four postures of the Buddhist practitioner: walking, standing, sitting and lying down (*gyōjū zaga* 行住坐臥), citing scriptures and commentaries to support his points. Jiun's illustrations link the four postures with corresponding activities of the monk: (1) begging; (2) encountering a teacher with respect and worshipping in the compound with other monks; (3) seated meditation; and (4) resting on the right side. Each of the drawings show the appropriate disposition of the robes for that activity.

The first posture is walking, which Jiun refers to as walking (*kinhin* 經行); and begging (*bun'ei* 分衛). The main part of the text discusses the practice of begging and the ten types of restrained eating. The accompanying illustration (JSZ 1.29) shows a monk wearing the *kesa* over both shoulders. He carries his begging bowl in his right hand nestled against his chest. His left hand holds two corners of the *kesa* in front of his body, the surplus fabric of the garment wrapped around his arm clockwise. The illustration

shows this outermost *kesa* with numerous panels, suggesting that it is a great robe, and the innermost garment, visible at the lower leg, is an single uncut rectangle of cloth with a border known as the *man'e* 縵衣. The folds of the *kesa* are worn high on the chest up to the neck so that the only skin showing is the face and neck, hands and feet. The illustration clearly shows how wearing the *kesa* over both shoulders affects the drape of the garment so that one corner hangs low in front of the knees as discussed in the Amida statue above. This is in contrast to the usual manner of wearing the *kesa* over one shoulder which produces a horizontal drape at the lower hem (as in the following illustration). Jiun's caption for the first illustration reads:

> [This] shows the robe worn over both shoulders, in the field of merit aspect. The corners of the robe wrap around the elbow clockwise [literally: in the same direction as circumambulating the Buddha], and [the *kesa*] is underneath the armpit. This is explained in [Daoxuan's] *Vinaya Revelations* in the fourth rule. In the *Commentary on the [Mahā] Vairocana Sūtra*, it says that the left hand holds two corners of the *kesa*. This is the manner of holding the *kesa*. The hand holds point of the corner close. And the corner that rides on the [left] shoulder returns to wrap around the elbow and into the hand so that the two corners are like a pair of ears.
>
> 通肩披衣福田相ヲ現シ。衣角臂ヲ遶テ於腋ノ下ニ在リ。感通ニ第四制ト謂ンハ是也。大日經疏ニ左手ニ兩衣角ヲ持ス。其ノ法袈裟ヲ取テ手ニ近尖角。及ビ搭 肩之角。臂ヲ繞シテ手入中ニニ角ヲ雙耳ノ如ナリ令ル。(JSZ 2.257).[32]

Jiun cites the *Five Part Vinaya* for instructions about holding the two points of the *kesa* in the left hand (fasc. 27, T 22.178a; JSZ 2.256). He expands the terse passage and explains that the two corners are from the upper left and right corners of the *kesa* when one is

wearing it. He then comments that recently in the esoteric school, this posture appears in the *mudrā* of the central figure of Vairocana in the Diamond maṇḍala. Jiun's approach in this passage follows his rule for monks, namely, that for matters not explained in the *vinaya* one may turn to other sources for clarification. In this case, Jiun considers artistic depictions to be an important resource for understanding how the *kesa* is worn.

The second posture of the four deportments is "standing," and Jiun explains that the term refers to residing in the monastery (*jū* 住) in contrast to going on pilgrimage or begging rounds (JSZ 1.30). The illustration shows a monk wearing *kesa* on his left shoulder with the right shoulder bare, a mode that shows respect towards others. Judging from the width of the panels in the illustration, it is probably intended to depict the seven panel *kesa* appropriate for activities within the compound. His hands are held in front of his body with palms together in a gesture of respect and worship. The caption for the illustration explains that when one is doing acts of reverence, then usually one uses the one-shoulder style. Jiun adds that this style is appropriate for novice monks (*an shamon igi* 案沙門威儀) (JSZ 2.258).

The third posture, "sitting," refers to seated meditation (JSZ 1.31). The illustration shows a monk seated on his mat (*nishidan* 尼師壇), wearing the *kesa* over both shoulders. This disposition of the *kesa* in the illustration is contradicted by the text, which describes the one-shoulder manner of wearing the *kesa* as proper when the body is sitting still in meditation (*shōshin tanza shi, hendan uhen ni shite.* 止身端座シ。偏袒右肩ニシテ。JSZ 2.262). His hands are posed in the gesture of meditation: palms facing upwards, with the fingers of the right hand resting on the fingers of the left hand, the two thumbs nearly touching in the center, forming a slightly collapsed oval shape.[33] In the main body of the text, however, Jiun describes the left hand resting on top of the right. The caption describes the ideal setting for meditation as being under a tree on one's sitting mat, with the legs folded in full lotus position, with the right leg resting on top. Jiun

notes that the tie of the robe is loosened, and that while sitting one releases (*datsuraku* 脫落) the ties of the inner robes (JSZ 2.262).

The fourth posture is reclining. Jiun explains that in all the postures one is always aware of one's practice, and he describes different positions of rest. The illustration shows a monk lying on his right side using his robes and sleeping mat as bedding (JSZ 1.32). In the caption, Jiun cites the *Mahāsāṇghika vinaya* as the source of brief instructions to fold the great robe and use the hand under it as a pillow to support the head, but he does not provide a source for his detailed drawing and explanation of how to use one's robes to make a bed. The caption describes the placement of the robes and the reclining mat from top to bottom as follows: the great robe is folded in four and rests below the right hand which supports the head as a pillow. The seven panel robe is used as a blanket and the reclining mat lies directly under the body of the monk, functioning as a sheet that protects the five panel robe beneath it, and finally the inner robe (*naionsō* 泥洹僧) rests directly on the ground.[34] In this way the monk's garments become a bed. It is likely that Jiun created these instructions himself based on passages that describe folding the seven panel robe in four to use as a seat (e.g., T 24.224b). A search of Chinese translations of *vinaya* texts did not yield the detailed description of the disposition of the other garments that Jiun offers here.[35] His exposition on this point could be used to confirm Daoxuan's interpretation that the term *gagu*, which literally means "reclining gear" is equivalent to the three robes. In this interpretation the three robes as an ascetic practice would serve as coverings for the body, a seat for meditation, and a bed on which to lie down at night, thus fulfilling the requirements of "few wants, knowledge of sufficiency" discussed in chapter one.

The descriptions of the four postures of the Buddhist monk in the *vinaya* and other Buddhist texts provide the structure of Buddhist physical practice. Jiun's section on the

four postures coordinates the preceding discussion of important iconic representations of Buddhas and teachers in Japan with the prescriptions in the *vinaya* regarding the practice of the *kesa*. Jiun uses textual descriptions with artistic representations of Buddhas and eminent teachers to deepen his understanding of the physical practice. Treating these two sources as complementary allows Jiun to show us that Buddhism indeed lives in Japan, and that the prescriptions of the *vinaya* may be understood by referring to the icons and textile artifacts that are in Japan. One need not travel to India or China to find the living practice of the *kesa*.

There are a number of paintings and statues of Jiun that serve as further illustrations of Jiun's teachings about the form and use of Buddhist robes. In 2004 the Osaka Art Museum and Sano Art Museum produced an exhibit of portraits of Jiun for his 200 year memorial. The paintings and statues that I use for this next section are from the Osaka Art Museum exhibition catalogue, *Shinjitsu no hito, Jiun Sonja* 真実の人、慈雲尊者 (hereafter, Osaka bijutsu 2004). These portraits and the actual robes made by his followers are a significant resource not only as artifacts in themselves, but as a guide to what elements Jiun and his followers considered to be most important. The *kesa* and other garments on the images of Jiun were a way to convey the physical appearance in a powerful manner. The portraits I will discuss here represent two types of settings: first, portraits that show Jiun wearing a plain colored *kesa*, sitting in meditation outdoors, reminiscent of his time at Two Dragon Hut; and second, portraits that show Jiun wearing a multi-colored pieced *kesa*, seated on a dais and performing the ritual of dharma transmission consecration (*denbō kanjō* 傳法灌頂).

The earliest painting that is likely to have served as a model for portraits of Jiun sitting meditation outdoors was made by Ryō Rikyō 柳里恭 (1704-1758) in the last year of his life. Rikyō, who was well educated and an accomplished painter, does not appear in the list of lay disciples, but he became firm friends with the young Jiun.[36] Rikyō

illustrated *Garments of the Way*, making drawings of the famous statues as well as illustrations of Jiun's discussion of the four postures discussed above (Osaka bijutsu 2004, 153). His depiction of the *kesa* and other garments in this work would have been directed by Jiun himself. For that reason, I am taking Rikyō's portrait of Jiun as a model of what Jiun himself hoped to convey about the *kesa* in art.

In the portrait, which is owned by Chōeiji in Osaka, Rikyō depicts Jiun sitting on a rocky crag with a fast flowing mountain stream on Jiun's right, and a tall broad-leaf tree in the background behind his left shoulder (Osaka bijutsu 2004, 34; plate 1). This setting is thought to be located near Two Dragon Hut on Mt. Ikoma near Nagao Falls (Osaka prefecture), where Jiun was in retreat for two years, from the age of forty-one. The inscription on the painting bears Jiun's own seal. The *kesa* is worn over both shoulders, and crosses fairly high on the chest, similar to the illustration of seated meditation in *Garments of the Way*. The color of the *kesa* is a rusty red of the shade referred to as *mokuran* 木蘭. The strips that demarcate each panel of the *kesa* are a slightly darker shade. Dotted lines along both sides of these strips illustrate the strip seam construction in which long strips of cloth are appliqued onto the pieced seams of the *kesa*. Judging by the width of the panels in proportion to the body and the fact that no lining fabric is depicted, the *kesa* appears to be a seven panel type. The grey sitting mat, which also shows stitching lines, is spread out with all four corners visible and is ample enough to protect the *kesa* from direct contact with the ground. One corner of the *kesa* with its reinforcing corner square clearly illustrated rests just below Jiun's hands which are in the *mudrā* of meditation. As in the illustrations from *Garments of the Way*, the right hand rests on the left hand. Jiun's under-robes, a soft grey that matches the color of the sitting mat, are drawn closely around his neck, dipping down slightly in the front as would the neckline of a garment that crosses over in the front of the chest. It is likely that this garment is the under-robe for the upper body that is called the *sōgishi* 僧祇支.[37] The top

of Jiun's head is partially bald, with a fringe of hair growth covering his lower head and chin. The portrait, which is held by Chōeiji, is finely drawn and has a surprising amount of detail in the depiction of the robes. It is also an unusually youthful image of Jiun, and the face bears a striking resemblance to the illustrations of the four postures in *Garments of the Way.*

In contrast to this portrayal of the youthful Jiun, a number of later portraits show an elderly Jiun sitting meditation on the crag near Two Dragon Hut. A good example is the portrait done by Yamamoto (Kenjirō) Gishō 山本 (健次郎) 義照 (fl. 1760), a lay disciple of Jiun, originally a vassal of Inaba 因幡. The portrait is now held at Nōman'in 能満院 in Nara. Based on the inscription on the back which indicates the location of Katsuragi mountain 葛城山, the painting was probably done after Jiun had retired to Kōkiji in 1776 (Osaka bijutsu 2004, 34; plate 2). Gishō is credited with many portraits of Jiun. He was considered to be the most prolific and skilled of the artists who depicted the master, earning the praise of Mindō Teiju 明堂諦濡 (1750-1830), one of Jiun's main disciples. The portrait shows an elderly Jiun in light brown robes sitting in meditation at the edge of a high cliff, with a waterfall to his right. His head is bent forward slightly with age, and the white beard, eyebrows and fringe of hair on his head are bushy. The *kesa* is a light brown color, of strip seam construction, indicated by the double lines of stitches. Jiun wears the *kesa* over both shoulders, but it has slipped down from the left shoulder so that the brown collar of the upper garment (*gishi*) and the white collar of the under shirt is visible. The edge of the drapery below Jiun's beard shows the back of the *kesa* turned to the outside, so that the plain lining fabric is visible, an indication that it is a great robe of nine or more panels. Jiun is seated on a sitting mat of olive green which has been folded crosswise at the end so that about six inches overlap. The borders, but not the reinforcing squares on the sitting mat are visible. Compared to the previous portrait, the details of the scenery and the *kesa* are softened considerably, but the depiction of the

kesa still retains important details.

The third painting of this type was done by Yamamoto Gishin 山本義仲 (fl. 1780), about whom little is known (Osaka bijutsu 2004, plate 3). On the back of the painting Gishin states that the portrait was commissioned by Jikei 慈鶏, one of Jiun's lay disciples, when Jiun was 80 years old. Gishin explains that Jikei gave explicit instructions for the depiction of the robes and the seated posture. This suggests that the details of the depiction of Jiun sitting meditation at the waterfall near Two Dragon hut were well known among his followers, and these portraits of Jiun were valued by his followers.

Finally, an anonymous painting done during the summer practice retreat (*ango* 安居) in 1804 records an image of Jiun during the last year of his life (Osaka bijutsu 2004, plate 4). The crag on which Jiun sits is similar to the preceding two paintings, although the details are somewhat sharper. Jiun's robe is of a similar brown color, and it falls on his left shoulder in a pattern similar to the two preceding portraits. The dedication on the back of the painting refers to being surrounded by a "cloud of compassion," during the summer retreat, a play on Jiun's name, "Compassion cloud." Although Jiun did not die until the eleventh month, his followers may have sensed that the end was near. We thus have portraits of Jiun sitting meditation outdoors which date from his young years to just before his death. It is likely that only the first portrait was modeled on actual physical circumstances and that the other paintings of this type are reminders of this time in Jiun's life, and of his intent to live a life of seclusion and meditation.

To what extent are the depictions of the robes in these portraits true to Jiun's teachings? It is not possible to fully address this question at this point, but a few preliminary conclusions may be reached. Rikyō's portrait probably adheres most closely to Jiun's ideal of the robe at this early period when he had just completed his major works

on the *kesa*, but before his community had begun the project of making one thousand *kesa* to be distributed to monks in the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement. The portrait thus provides a visual record of Jiun's ideas about the *kesa* at the time. First, the red color of the robe provides an interpretation of the reddish brown color referred to as *mokuran*. The actual shade indicated by the word *mokuran* covers a wide range of colors from deep brownish purple (the color of ripe fruit) to a brighter, almost orange or golden color. It is likely that the color of the robe in the portrait would have been an attempt to show Jiun's idea about *mokuran*. The reddish color in Rikyō's portrait was not reproduced in any of the later portraits in our small sample where the *kesa* is uniformly portrayed as pale brown.[38] Second, Rikyō carefully indicated stitching lines and other aspects of the construction, and Gishō's portrait also faithfully reproduces these lines of stitching. In the later portraits these details drop away, so that only the strips dividing the robe into panels are depicted. Finally, although all four portraits show Jiun wearing the *kesa* over both shoulders, only Rikyō's portrait shows the *kesa* in place, that is, just after the wearer has arranged it. The close arrangement of the under-robes beneath the *kesa* also suggest a posed picture intended to indicate how the robe is to be worn. With movement, the *kesa* would naturally slip off the shoulder. Later portraits show this more relaxed position. Rikyō's painting, however, does not show a natural relaxation of the posture. It is as if Jiun had just put on his robes, arranged them for meditation, and had not moved since. These features suggest that the portrait was intended as a model of the color and construction of the *kesa* and sitting mat, and the manner of wearing it while sitting in meditation. In contrast, Gishō's portrait of an older Jiun shows the *kesa* slipping off the shoulder to such an extent that it looks almost as though Jiun were wearing the *kesa* covering the right rather than the left shoulder. The *gishi* and undershirt are clearly visible. This disposition of the *kesa* is repeated in the other portraits, as if these artists had taken Gishō's work as their model. Given Gishō's status as the most prolific of Jiun's

portrait artists, it is likely that his work set the standard, not Rikyō's, even though Rikyō's work may have been more authoritative due to his collaboration with Jiun in illustrating *Garments of the Way.*

The second type of portrait of Jiun shows him as a teacher in the prime of life performing the ceremony of *dharma* transmission consecration. In the paintings and statues of this type that I discuss below Jiun sits on a dais with a flask of water placed before him. His left hand holds up the corners of his *kesa* which is worn over both shoulders. His right hand holds the five pointed *vajra* (*gokosho* 五鈷杵) symbolizing the ability to cut through delusions and hindrances. The *kesa* depicted on the statues and paintings of Jiun in this mode, however, is a multi-colored robe with black strip seams, in contrast to the single colored *kesa* in the Two Dragon Hut portrait type. Here there is a real effort to portray the robe referred to by Jiun and his followers as the rag robe. It is not, of course, unusual for an important teacher to be represented wearing the rag robe. As I discussed in chapter two, the multi-color pieced robe appears to have functioned not only as a sign of Buddha's close disciples and eminent teachers, but it also became part of the iconography of Shōtoku. What is remarkable is that Jiun, or his community, chose to depict him in this particular way. That is, using this type of *kesa* to show Jiun performing this ritual shows that they may have regarded the rag robe as representative of the transmission from Buddha to his disciples, and therefore the proper garment for a representation of this ritual. More research is necessary to determine whether this type of depiction follows Japanese Buddhist artistic conventions, or whether this was a new interpretation created by Jiun's *True Dharma Vinaya* movement.[39]

Whether Jiun himself approved of this type of representation is also not clear. The two statues, from Mizuyakushiji 水薬師寺 in Shimogyō-ku, Kyoto; and Chōeiji, Osaka, are both unsigned (Osaka bijutsu 2004, 39; figs. 11 and 12). These statues show a multi-colored robe, but the details of construction are minimal. On the Chōeiji statue the

colors are green, orange, yellow and tan (Osaka bijutsu 2004, 34; plate 11). The *kesa* worn over both shoulders is turned outward at the neck so that the cream colored lining is visible. The collar of the *gishi* and the under shirt are visible. The depiction of the *kesa* in the Mizuyakushiji statue is identical, although the colors are very faded and the facial expression is quite different.

There are also paintings with this theme. A close match is a painting held by Sanmiyaji 三宮寺 in Kyoto (JSZ 0.fig. 3; Ueyama 2004, cover illustration). The colored pieces of the robe are quite distinct and clear: pink, orange, light blue, navy; and the strip seams dark brown. Lines of running stitches cover the pieced face of the *kesa* and the strip seams show the horse tooth pattern of stitching. The *kesa* is worn over both shoulders and the backing is turned outward to show a bright green backing. The Sanmiyaji painting shows an attention to detail about the construction of the *kesa* that is less clear in the two statues.[40] Nevertheless, these depictions of Jiun indicate a close association between the rite of transmission and the multi-color pieced robe in his *True Dharma Vinaya* movement.[41]

These portraits suggest that to some degree Jiun influenced the way in which his followers depicted the *kesa*. Rikyō, because of his work on *Garments of the Way*, would have received instructions directly from Jiun. His work was then imitated and interpreted by Gishō who faithfully reproduced details of construction, the manner of wearing the robe, and the use of the sitting mat. As these paintings proliferated, however, details begin to drop away. Unfortunately, the only images of Jiun in the transmission ritual style that I had access to are unsigned works, so it is difficult to say whether he approved of these kinds of images. Nevertheless, the detail of the "horse tooth" stitch shown on the strip seams of the Sanmiyaji painting suggests that the artist was likely to have been associated with Jiun or his community. Thus, these representations of Jiun serve both as a memorial to the departed master and as a visual legacy of his teaching about the *kesa*,

not unlike Ganjin's own portrait statue discussed in chapter two. These paintings and statues could be expected to outlast the actual robes that Jiun's followers made. Given Jiun's interest in how statues and paintings reveal teachings about the construction and the use of Buddhist robes, it is likely that he took the opportunity to leave his own legacy in art, as well as in the actual artifacts of *kesa* sewn by his followers.

I now turn to the project described in *Record of the Project of Sewing One Thousand Robes* (hereafter the *Thousand Robe Project*), an activity that had broad implications for Jiun's community of followers and especially, the participation of women in Jiun's *True Dharma Vinaya* movement.

When the *Thousand Robe Project* was launched in 1766, the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement was firmly established and the implementation of Jiun's teachings on the construction of *kesa* had gained momentum.[42] Before going into retreat at Two Dragon Hut in 1758, Jiun had completed his major works on the *kesa* as well as his commentary on Yijing's *Record of the Southern Seas*, a project that he took on at the urging of his close friend, the Mt. Kōya scholar-monk, Shingen Honnen 眞源本然 (1689-1758).[43] During the years that Jiun was in residence at Keirinji, he had lectured extensively on the *vinaya* and his own works on the *kesa* as well as a number of Zen and Shingon texts.

In 1756 Jiun and a number of his ordained and lay disciples were invited to Shitennōji 四天王寺 to view two *kesa* from the Hōryūji collection. These two *kesa* were the multi-color pieced *kesa* believed to have been worn by Shōtoku, and the red *kesa* believed to have belonged to Bodhidharma, and later Huisi, the Tendai patriarch. As we saw in chapter two, Heian period legends of Shōtoku as the reincarnated Huisi indicate that he recognized his former *kesa*. The Tokugawa traveling exhibitions of the "seven treasures of Prince Shōtoku" capitalized on this legend, displaying the Shōtoku *kesa* among the treasures as a significant source of income for Hōryūji. Jiun, however, was

not alive for any of these major exhibitions. The invitation for Jiun and his disciples to closely examine these highly revered *kesa* in a small select group suggests that Jiun's reputation was growing.

Shōtoku Kesa, introduced previously as the record of this event, was found in 1878 at the storehouse of the Chōfukuji nunnery. Hase, who edited the modern edition of Jiun's collected works, explains that he decided to include the piece in the modern collection because it contains direct quotes from Jiun. Hase points out that Jiun mentions the Shōtoku *kesa* by name in the expanded version of *Garments of the Way*, but the drawings contained in *Shōtoku Kesa* were not included (JSZ 1.339). *Shōtoku Kesa* is likely to be one of the earliest works produced by members of Jiun's *True Dharma Vinaya* movement, and therefore shows how his followers understood Jiun's teaching.

Shōtoku Kesa records that when the *kesa* were shown to Jiun and his companions, they bowed and chanted the three refuges. Jiun remarked,

> For the last four or five hundred years the garment of the way has been lost....I know that I myself made mistakes by my shallowness and I felt humble, and deeply unsatisfied. Later, relying on the *vinaya*, scriptures and treatises I returned to this ragged demeanor which I now wear.
>
> 四五百年來方服儀ヲ失ス。。。自ラ文カサル之ヲ過テ陋為ル知テ。意竊ニ慊ラ不。後ニ準シテ毘尼ト經論與ニ。改其ノ弊儀ヲ改テ而自ラ披着ス。(JSZ 1.329).

The group of observers included two nuns, Kōhō Chikyō 高峯智興 (d. 1764) and her disciple, Gakyō Ejō 瓦鏡慧上 (d. 1799), both of whom had received the full precepts in 1751 (JSZ 0.485-487). At Jiun's request Chikyō and Ejō later made two copies of the linen seven panel Shōtoku robe. Jiun gave one copy to Shitennōji, and kept the second copy for his group to study.[44]

Shōtoku Kesa uses various terms to refer to the *kesa*. Jiun is quoted early in the record as using the terms "ragged demeanor," *heigi* 弊儀, and "garment of the way" *hōbuku* 方服. In a later passage, the author refers to viewing the *shiso* 緇素, a term which, as I discussed in chapter one, usually refers to ordained and lay Buddhists, but may also refer to Buddhist robes as it does here. More striking, however, is the absence of the traditional term, pieced robe, *nōe* 衲衣, in favor of the term rag robe, *funzōe* 糞掃衣. As I discussed in chapter two, the Hōryūji *kesa* were consistently referred to by the term *nōe* until the late Tokugawa period. The catalogues made for the 1800 and 1840 public displays in Edō, however, show the increasing use of the designation *funzōe* . I suggested that the shift in terminology may have come from the influence of Jiun and his followers. The appearance of this term in *Shōtoku Kesa* may be the earliest incidence of its use in reference to these ancient *kesa*. At the very least, *Shōtoku Kesa* demonstrates the determination of Jiun's followers in the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement to identify this ancient and revered *kesa* as a rag robe.

The participants were permitted to examine the robes closely and Jiun took the measurements himself. The record contains many details about the construction, including the shape and position of the ties, the size of the seams and the fact that there were three lines of stitching in the border, as seen in Yijing's instructions in his *Record of the Southern Seas*. It also records details about the extent and location of damage to the *kesa*. The record includes drawings and explanations of the dimensions and elements of construction for both robes, as well as a complete record of the participants at the viewing, and those who helped in making two copies of the Shōtoku *kesa*. This experience of viewing and handling these ancient robes and then making copies of them must have inspired Jiun's followers when they undertook the project of making one thousand robes.

Ten years later the project of making one thousand robes "according to the

dharma" began with a ceremonial presentation of a five panel robe made by Jien Jōshō 慈圓淨照 (d. 1776), a nun at Jigen'an 慈眼庵, during the 1766 New Year's assembly of monks (JSZ 0.492-493).[45] Jōshō vowed to make a thousand robes and distribute them to the monks in Jiun's *True Dharma Vinaya* movement. This first robe, a five panel linen robe dyed a medium brown color identified as *mokuran* was completed by Jōshō during the winter retreat of 1764, and was presented to Jiun in a public assembly on the sixteenth day of the New Year. The project of sewing one thousand robes eventually involved the efforts of over one hundred and fifty nuns who were ordained by Jiun. Forty years later, one year after Jiun's death in 1804, the last of the thousand robes was completed.

This project was painstakingly documented in *Record of Sewing One Thousand Robes* (*Hōe hotsugan saisei no bo* 法衣發願裁製之簿; also as *Sen'e saisei bo* 千衣裁製之簿 in JSZ 18; hereafter, *Thousand Robes*). About half of the record is in Jiun's own hand, suggesting that he was actively involved with the project, but it also shows how Jiun allowed his students to take responsibility for the teaching without overshadowing them.[46] *Thousand Robes* includes information for each robe: type of robe, number of panels, fabric, color, method of construction, stitching pattern (e.g., horse tooth, bird foot), finished measurement, Sanskrit characters inscribed on the robe, the date of completion, and the name of the sewer and other helpers. In some cases the donor of the fabric or the recipient of the robe is also recorded. There are remarkably few lacunae, most of which appear to be due to the loss of a page of the record. There are four gaps of consecutive robe numbers, making a total of thirty one robes unaccounted for out of the full one thousand.[47] The robes were made primarily by female followers of Jiun: nuns, women of the court, wives of Daimyō and townspeople. Over one hundred and fifty nuns worked on the robes.

The signed preface to *Thousand Robes* is by Gomyō 護明 (1734-1780), one of Jiun's leading disciples, who received transmission from Jiun in 1766, the year the project

began.[48] Gomyō's preface sets the activity of sewing the robes in religious and historical context. First, he records Jōshō's pledge given when she offered the robe:

> This robe is the first of one thousand robes that [we] will gradually sew. I present this to the assembly of monks in accord with the *dharma*. I vow that this superior field of merit will nurture the seed of Buddhahood, and the sprout of abiding wisdom will arise. The tree of the true dharma has a firm and steadfast trunk, and the branches and leaves support a spreading canopy of greenery over the *dharma* realm. All living beings will cut off the afflictions and delusions and achieve awakening. By observing the precepts they will rejoice and praise.[49]
>
> 此の衣ヲ首と為。漸次ニ千領ヲ製シ。之ヲ如法僧伽ニ奉シ。願ハ其ノ勝上ノ福田。佛種子ヲ植エ長シ覺芽ヲ生。正法之樹。莖幹牢固ニ枝葉扶疏普ク法界ヲ覆ヒ。一切衆生ニ轉依ノみょう界ヲ證セント。因テ齋慶讃ス。
> (JSZ 16.29).

Gomyō next discusses the role of the *kesa* as the proper clothing of all Buddhas who always rely on the *kesa*. In this section of the introduction, Gomyō establishes the significance of the *kesa* in the Buddhism, then discusses its historical significance in Japan. He describes the five vows concerning the *kesa* in the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture,* explaining the context of the vow taken in the presence of Ratnagarbha and the force of these vows which, he argues, is effective even during the time of *mappō*. After this brief discussion of the meaning of the *kesa* in Buddhist thought, Gomyō raises the precedent of the eighth century nobleman, Nagaya Ō, who produced one thousand *kesa* and sent them to Tang China as gifts to the Buddhist monks there. Gomyō quotes the four verses that Nagaya Ō had inscribed on the upper border of each *kesa,* arguing that it was these verses that convinced Ganjin of Japan's dedication to Buddhism and influenced him to bring the *vinaya* line to Japan.[50]

Having raised the precedent of Nagaya Ō's *kesa*, Gomyō explains the religious significance of Jōshō's vow. He refers to Jōshō by her alternate name, Zen'ni:

> Now, Zen'ni's vow is in a changed world, but the intent is the same. These one thousand correct robes will be given to one thousand members of the *sangha* of the true *dharma*. Accordingly, one thousand people will authoritatively have the proper demeanor and will uphold the true Dharma. Due to the karmic connection of Zen'ni's vow, for some among these the pure morality of upholding the precepts, the pure illumination of meditation, and the clarity of wisdom will arise. 今ヤ也禪尼發願世異ニシテ趣ヲ同ス。梳レ夫レ千領正則之衣。千ノ正法ノ僧伽ニ施シ奉キハ。則千衆儼然トシテ正威儀ヲ以テ正法ヲ維持ス。其ノ中若干ノ持戒清浄。若干ノ禪定澄浄。若干智慧明徹。禪尼發願ノ因縁ニ自ヨリテ而起ラン乎。(JSZ 16.30)

Here, Gomyō expresses a rather modest result from the vow: those who receive proper robes will experience the Buddhist training of morality, meditation and wisdom. The next sentence, however, abruptly shifts away from individual and collective religious practice to claim the *kesa* as a powerful guardian of the state. Gomyō attributes the success of the Tang dynasty to the power of the rag robe:

> Emperor Taizong of the Tang had his people sew rag robes for the army to receive. When faced with the enemy, the [opponents] would suddenly disappear, and [that region] would become part of China. They suppressed the four [groups of] barbarians and initiated three hundred years of a great period. Accordingly, in Japan it will now be superlative fortune for the nation. For the holy ruler and the wise retainer the country will be at ease, and for the fruitful populace, the evil regions will shrink away at last. Some among those of provinces, castles, and villages, and some of those [who are] knowledgeable or foolish, wise or unfilial

will see and hear of this seed that is growing, and will make a superlative connection to the true Dharma. This will also arise from the karmic connection of Zen'ni's vow.

唐ノ太宗世民。糞掃衣ヲ裁シテ軍中ニ戴持スル。向フ所敵無ク遂ニ中國ニ位シ。四夷ヲ撫シ三百年ノ鴻基開ク。則今本朝ニ在テ國家ノ勝福ト為リ。君聖ニ臣賢ニ國安ク民饒カニ魔境斥逐シ。其中若干ノ郡國城邑。若干ノ智愚賢不肖。見聞種ト為リ正法ノ勝縁と為ルモ。亦禪尼發願ノ因縁ニ自テ而起ラン乎。 (JSZ 16.30).

Earlier in the introduction, Gomyō discussed the five vows from *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*, whose fifth vow declares that those who enter battle carrying a scrap of the *kesa* will defeat their enemies. Here, Gomyō tells how Emperor Taizong gave rag robes to his soldiers who then successfully routed the enemy. He offers this as a historical proof of the efficacy of the vow in *Compassionate Lotus Scripture*.[51] From this point, Gomyō proposes that Jōshō's vow and the project of making the robes is an act that will bring peace to the nation and initiate a period of prosperity and strength. Clearly, the project is not merely to provide correct robes for monks, but also to protect the nation through the power of the vow. Gomyō then returns to the religious aspects of the project:

So naturally, the power of this vow must be renewed. On the borders of these robes will be sewn the mark of the ten stages of the Bodhisattva and the ten powers of the Buddha as well as the record number [of the *kesa*]. We must understand the intention. Specifically, the *kesa* is already the form of the Buddha's enlightenment, and so the thousand robes bring about the manifestation of a thousand Buddhas. Between a Buddha and a Buddha there is no difference, and wide or narrow, it is difficult to measure. One panel, one seam extends outward to the three worlds [past, present and future]. Each stitch, each cut, one

after another extends in the ten directions. You must carefully receive, think deeply and clearly investigate its form to the end.

然バ則此ノ發願之力鮮鮮ナル可ラ不矣。其ノ所製ノ衣。縁ノ上ニ於テ縫テ十度十力等ノ目ヲ為以記數ヲ為ス。其ノ趣解ス可シ也。更ニ詳スルニ。袈裟ハ既に釋迦佛ノ三摩耶形為レバ。則千衣ハ千佛ノ出現。佛佛異ナラ不廣狭測り難シ。一条一葉三世ニ彌亘シ。一緘一刀羅ス十方ヲ該。亦審諦ニ頂受シ思惟シ觀察ス可キ所ナル而已。(JSZ 16.30).

Gomyō's preface offers an opportunity to see how Jiun's disciples interpreted his teachings about the *kesa*. Gomyō chose to emphasize the political nature of the *kesa* and the project in tandem with its religious aspects. Although he emphasizes the religious result of the precedent of Nagaya Ō's thousand robes, it was also a political act of offering tribute, and Gomyō clearly makes a connection between the religious and the political benefits of being "in accord with the *dharma*."

Gomyō's preface is followed by a page of remarks and scriptural citations about the religious meaning of the *kesa*. This section is unsigned and Hase does not clarify whether the original was in Jiun's hand. Kyūma, however, cites part of this section as Jiun's own remarks (Ueyama 2004, 128). The last few sentences of the page are particularly noteworthy:

How great is the robe of liberation, these vestments that are a formless field of merit. How is it that the form of sentient beings must all be beyond form. Panels and seams [lit. branches and leaves] are without doubt [according to] the rule. Stitch after stitch awakening, the lamp of the Dharma continues to shine through a thousand, ten thousand kalpas.

大哉解脱服。無相福田衣。衆相何ゾ必シモ諸相ノ外ナラン。条葉規違無ク緘緘起キ劫。法燈光輝ク聯ス。 (JSZ 16.31).

The first sentence, "How great is the robe of liberation, a formless field of merit" is identical to verses from an ordination rite from the *Pure Rules for Zen Monasteries* (*Chanyuan qingui* 禪苑清規) that are spoken by the master as he gives the *kesa* to his disciple.[52] In contemporary Japanese Sōtō Zen, the verses are also used daily when donning the *kesa*, based on Dōgen's teachings in "Merit of the Kesa." Dōgen explains that while he was studying with his teacher, Rujing, in China, he heard this verse chanted by the monk sitting next to him, and had a deep upwelling of feeling. But why does this verse appear here, and what function does it play in the introduction to *Thousand Robes*?

The first two lines of the chant appear to be a closing verse for the introduction to the *Thousand Robes.* In his wide reading Jiun might have encountered the verses from *Pure Rules for Zen Monasteries* or possibly from "Merit of the Kesa" while studying with his Sōtō master, Daibai. This opens intriguing possibilities for investigating Jiun's relationship to Sōtō Zen and to what degree Dōgen's writing may have influenced Jiun's approach to the *kesa*, a topic that awaits further research. Here, Jiun uses the verses to compose a poem for those who are sewing the *kesa*, encouraging them to believe that every stitch continues the light of the Buddhist teaching.

The fact that this section is unsigned, however, means that Jiun may not have actually written it, but it may be significant for Jiun's practice community. If this page, rather than being a crafted essay by Jiun, is actually a compilation of statements about the *kesa* that Jiun frequently made and his students recorded, then whatever is included here takes on the significance of a frequently repeated catalogue of the virtues of the *kesa* and, in the case of this short coda, promotes the virtue of sewing the *kesa*.

Another question is why the vow to make one thousand robes was ascribed to Jōshō, an otherwise unimportant figure in Jiun's movement. There are very few details about Jōshō's life, and she does not have the same prominence as other women ordained

by Jiun, nor does she take a leading role in the project. In *Thousand Robes*, Jōshō is credited with making the first robe, but it is a small project of a five panel *kesa*, and she was helped by Gibun 義文 (d. 1773) who eventually made sixteen *kesa* and Enichi 慧日 (1739-1806) who had participated in the viewing of the Shōtoku *kesa* and went on to make thirty-two *kesa* for the project (JSZ 0.489; JSZ 16. 240). In addition, a final sentence at the end of volume five of the record states that with the completion of the thousandth robe in 1805, Jiun's vow was fulfilled, apparently contradicting Jōshō's role in initiating the project by her vow.

How did Jōshō become the focus of the vow to make one thousand robes, rather than Jiun himself? Hase suggests that the truth lies somewhere between these two statements in the record: that perhaps Jiun frequently mentioned the thousand robes made by Nagoya-Ō, and that Jōshō was suddenly inspired to make a similar vow. I would add that ascribing the vow to Jōshō and having Gomyō write the introduction reveals Jiun as a teacher who understood the power of delegating responsibility. Jōshō's idealistic enthusiasm provided an opportunity for Jiun to inspire the community, especially the nuns, to take on this challenging project.

According to *Thousand Robes*, the first thirty *kesa* were produced in the first seventeen years, from 1766 to 1783. Hase reports that only a few entries in this first volume of the original text are in Jiun's hand. In the next ten years, however, two hundred and sixty one *kesa* were produced, and the entries are entirely in Jiun's hand. In the following five years Jiun made very few notations in the record, but the sewers produced two hundred *kesa*, an increase of 150%. This data suggests that until Jiun became actively involved, the project was languishing. After the period of ten years when Jiun recorded all of the robes, the participants became more productive and the nuns began to take on more responsibility until finally they controlled all aspects of the project.

Did Jiun and his followers intended to provide each of the monks and nuns with a set of three robes? If this were the case, then one would expect to see a fairly regular alternation of the three types of robes in the record. Instead, seven panel robes predominate, suggesting that Jiun and his followers did not intend to revolutionize Japanese Buddhist robes by exclusively wearing the set of three robes as described in the *vinaya*.[53] Indeed, as we saw with the portraits of Jiun, the single *kesa* was worn over the Chinese style sleeved robe and the Japanese style *kimono*. Judging from their fewer numbers, the great robes of nine to twenty five panels were probably reserved for those monks who had attained the rank of *ajari* 阿闍梨 which brought with it a higher level of authority, and for other purposes, such as gifts. Almost all the robes are made of linen or cotton, the latter often used for the simple uncut under-robe. The color is usually listed as *mokuran* or indeterminate color, *ejiki* 壊色, with a few robes identified as "blue." Rag robes are mostly great robes, although there are a few five and seven panel rag robes. The sewing construction in the majority of the *kesa* is the cut-and-sewn method. The strip seam method is of course used in all the rag robes. The stitching pattern is usually the horse tooth pattern.

During 2004-2006 I had the opportunity to view some of the *kesa* from the thousand robes project that were stored at Chōeiji and Kōkiji. At Kōkiji the collection has been relatively undisturbed, but during the Meiji period Chōeiji received many robes from other temples to protect them (private conversation with Kanamori, July 2004).[54] At Chōeiji we found several instances where the ample information recorded on the box did not correspond to the robes that were stored within them. Since the robes themselves were not inscribed with the record number, date or the names of the sewer and the donor of the cloth, once a robe is separated from its box, the only identifying information is the type of robe, its color, and the Siddham script sewn onto it. Even when the physical features of the *kesa* correspond to the information on the box, it can be quite difficult to

precisely identify its record number. In spite of these problems, both collections provide a wealth of information about how these robes were made.

To begin with, the stitching on the *kesa* in both collections is extremely fine, about seven to nine stitches per centimeter (Fieldnotes 5-27-04). Based on photographs made with a macro lens at Chōeiji we determined that the thread used to sew the robes was identical to the linen fabric, suggesting that sewing thread was produced by unraveling the cloth edges after it had been dyed. This process would be time consuming, but since most sewing thread for garments is silk, using threads from the linen robe fabric would suggest that they made this effort to conform to Daoxuan's prohibition against silk.

In other ways, the robes also conform to Daoxuan's teachings about the robe in *Revelations of the Vinaya,* notably Daoxuan's interpretation about the proper way to line the great robe. According to the *vinaya* a great robe is two layers. The lining is made by attaching an uncut *man'e* to the back. In the case of the cut-and-sewn method, the portion of the garment where the seams overlap will be three layers, not two, when the backing is applied (T 45.880a).[55] Daoxuan's solution was to individually line each of the field portions of a cut-and-sewn robe with a rectangular piece of fabric slightly smaller than the inner portion. The resulting unlined seams would thus have only two layers. This method also ensures that the lining, instead of obscuring the field pattern, actually highlights this construction when light shines through the *kesa.* Yuanzhao describes Daoxuan's method and promotes it as the best solution to the problem in his *Six Necessities,* so Japanese *vinaya* reformers would have been familiar with this lining technique (T 45.899a). All the cut and sewn great robes in the Chōeiji and Kōkiji collections that I saw were made this way, and the technique has been continued by some Sōtō sewing groups.[56]

On May 27, 2004 I went to Kōkiji with a group of women who sew *kesa*.[57] We were shown great robes from thirteen to twenty-five panels that were made in the thousand robe project. Each of the robes was stored in a box, sometimes two robes to a box. In at least one case we were able to successfully coordinate the information on the box lid with its record in *Thousand Robes*. Number 557 of the *Record* describes a thirteen panel robe completed by Nun Sōshu 宗珠 on the twenty fifth day of the fifth month of 1793, the sixth out of the ten robes that Sōshu had vowed to make (JSZ 16.151). The *Record* identifies it as a thirteen panel robe, the color of *mokuran*. The fabric is identified as "western," said to be a type of Korean cloth that was received second hand from Ryūkyū 琉球 (Okinawa). The record explains that because there was not enough fabric it was supplemented with silk scraps. The writing on the box lid provides the same information as *Thousand Robes*. We established the identity of the robe based on the fact that it is a thirteen panel robe made with the horse tooth stitch, and marked with the same Sanskrit characters as in these two written sources. It is worth noting that not only the usual categories are employed in the description, but also the anomalies that make this robe unique, for example, the decision to supplement the fabric with silk, the fabric's foreign origin, and its place within Sōshu's personal vow.

Other features of the *kesa* include Sanskrit characters on the border of the upper right hand corner of the robe, as promised in Gomyō's preface.[58] The Sanskrit characters are written on the front with red ink, and then outlined in the same backstitch as the rest of the robe so that when viewed from the reverse side of the *kesa*, the stitching creates a clear outline of the Sanskrit character. From the front, the stitches appear as small dots. When worn on the left shoulder with the right corner thrown over the shoulder to the back, as Jiun discussed in regard to Ganjin's portrait statue, this Sanskrit character would be plainly visible to a person standing behind the wearer. In addition, three to five grains identified as *śarīra* are placed inside the reinforcing square at the corner of the border.

Most of the great robes that I saw at Chōeiji and Kōkiji had *śarīra* in the corners. The color is a warm shade of medium brown. This great robe is lined using Daoxuan's method in which the field portions of the robe are individually lined.

In addition to details about the physical aspects of the robe and who made it, many of the entries in *Thousand Robes* also note who received the robes. Hase compiled a list of the names of the robe sewers and the number of *kesa* they sewed, followed by a list of recipients (JSZ 16.240-250). The list of recipients reveals that in addition to members of the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement *kesa* were given to clerics associated with other schools, lay people, temples and even statues. For example, entry number 24 describes a *kesa* made in 1769 that was sent to Zuigan 瑞岩, the head monk (*zagen* 座元) of Hekigyoku-an 碧玉庵, a subtemple of the Rinzai Zen lineage of Daitokuji 大徳寺. Entry number 301 indicates that in 1785 a seven panel *kesa* was given to Uchiyama Kyōjun 内山孝順 of the Jōdo temple, Zōjōji 増上寺, which was closely associated with the ruling Tokugawa family. Robes were also sent to the Buddha statues of Zenkōji and Seiryōji whose images illustrate *Garments of the Way* (JSZ 16.247). In 1779 Jiun sent a twenty five panel *kesa* to Gomomozono 後桃園 (r. 1758-1779) who was quite ill. Hase writes that the *kesa* Jiun sent was number 62 in the record, a *kesa* that had been used when the Princess Fujiwara Tomoko received the ten good precepts in 1771 (JSZ 0.97). These examples suggest that Jiun used these robes to strengthen relationships with influential people in other Buddhist schools, in the *bakufu* and in the court.

There is also evidence that Jiun and his followers used the project to experiment with different aspects of robe practice. For example, entry number 61 states that Gibun chanted Sanskrit *dhāraṇi* with each stitch; entry number 53 describes a project of making a *kesa* modeled on the Hōryuji *kesa* believed to have belonged to Bodhidharma; and entry number 35 describes a seven panel *kesa* made in 1773 that was used as a *kaṭhina* robe in a ceremony held in the seventh month of that year. The project of making one thousand

robes thus went beyond its original stated promise of making *kesa* "according to the *dharma*" for monks in the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement. It became a kind of laboratory for experimenting with different approaches to the religious practice of sewing and using robes.

The sewing project and the robes depicted in portraits of Jiun reveal the development of a community of monks, nuns and lay people that shared common values in their focus on the *kesa*. These included a range of activities and expression: artistic representations, sewing, donating fabric, using the robes in precept ceremonies, making merit for one's relatives by sewing robes, making models of ancient forms of the *kesa* and many other activities. In both the artistic representations and in the activity of making copies of ancient *kesa*, there is a great attention to minute details of the robe construction. The lay people who made these paintings and the nuns who made the copies and the *kesa* according to Jiun's interpretation of the *vinaya* seemed to understand how vital their role was in preserving ancient knowledge of *kesa* in their own lifetime so that the teaching would continue in the future. The experience of directly examining *kesa* from the Hōryūji collection and then using this experience to make copies apparently had a tremendous impact on building the confidence of the nuns, and perhaps even Jiun himself. To my knowledge, no other Buddhist group during the Tokugawa period or indeed, throughout Japanese Buddhist history, managed to achieve the depth of understanding and practical application of the *vinaya* teachings on the *kesa*. In addition, Jiun's extensive scholarship on the *kesa* profoundly influenced later research, including the Sōtō Zen teacher Mokushitsu Ryōyū whose work is introduced in the next section.

Part 4. Sōtō writings on the *kesa*

A central tenet of contemporary Sōtō Zen *kesa* sewing groups is that the Buddhist robe is one and the same as the Buddha's teaching: *ehō ichinyo* 衣法一如. These groups believe that this teaching is derived from Dōgen's fascicles, "Merit of the Kesa" and "Transmission of the Robe."[59] The idea that the *kesa* was identical to the Buddhist teaching was reinforced in the late Tokugawa period by a group of clergy who were convinced that Dōgen's view of the *kesa* was an essential element of his vision of the Buddhist life. They supplemented their study of the *Shōbō genzō* with research into monastic regulations.[60] Since many of them lived in the city of Nagoya this area became a magnet for others interested in studying Dōgen's teaching about the Buddhist robe. Much of contemporary scholarship on the Buddhist robe continues to come out of universities in the Nagoya area, especially Aichi Gakuin University 愛知学院大学, where Kawaguchi Kōfū 川口高風 (1948-) teaches.[61]

Most of the first works written on Buddhist robes during the Tokugawa period by Sōtō monks were written in Chinese (*kanbun*). The study of Buddhist robes remained the province of specialists and was not commonly known or understood.[62] The 1768 *Guidelines for Dharma Robes of Buddhist Monks* (*Shakushi hōe kun* 釋氏法衣訓; ZSSZ Shingi vol. 2; hereafter *Dharma Robes*) by Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769) was the first work by a Sōtō priest that was written in accessible Japanese (Kawaguchi 1984, 6). This work was frequently reprinted and became an important introduction to the study of the Buddhist robe that raised awareness of the issue for Sōtō monks.

Shōbō genzō scholars attempted to understand Dōgen's writings about the robe in the context of *vinaya* studies in order to strengthen Sōtō Zen claims to authenticity in regard to the robe. Dōgen's two fascicles on the Buddhist robe are substantial essays entirely devoted to religious aspects of the Buddhist robe, a rarity before the Tokugawa

period. By choosing to emphasize the importance of the robe in Dōgen's thought, the *Shōbō genzō* scholars had hit upon an aspect of Buddhist thought that had not been addressed as vigorously by the founders of other schools.

Two texts central to the development of *kesa* sewing groups in the twentieth century came out of this Nagoya group: *Proper Dharma Attire* (*Hōbuku kakushō* 法服格正, ZSSZ *Shingi*, vol. 2) written in Japanese by Mokushitsu Ryōyō 默室良要 (1775-1823) in 1821; and *Deep Meaning of the Field of Merit* (*Fukuden taisui* 福田滯邃, in Kawaguchi (1984); hereafter *Field of Merit*) written in Chinese by Sōkō Raizen 祖光来禅 (1795 - ?) in 1825. Both authors sought to explicate Dogen's essays using citations from scriptures, *vinaya* and treatises as well as Chinese texts and commentaries. Kawaguchi has recovered some premodern private study books on *Field of Merit* which suggest that even though this text was readily available and lectured on during this period people could not easily understand the text without annotation. For the succeeding seventy years, however, only Sōkō's work was publicly available (from 1825-1896). Mokushitsu's work was kept in private hands, passed down to disciples who made hand-written copies of the text.

Field of Merit is a short, dense work that is studded with citations.[63] Sōkō explains that when he was ordained as a child, he noticed the difference between the robes he had received in ordination and the robes depicted in ancient statues. His search for the answer to these questions led him to Nagoya where he joined the group of monks engaged in studying the *Shōbō genzō*. It was among these monks that Sōkō first became convinced that Dōgen's teaching was intimately connected with the Buddhist robe. *Field of Merit* is a product of his studies with his fellow students, including Mokushitsu Ryōyō, but it relies on the research on the Buddhist robe conducted by clerics of other schools during the Tokugawa period. The organization of topics follows the standard list: names for the robe, its origin as the Buddha's teaching, materials to be used in making the robe,

the colors for dying, and details of construction. *Field of Merit* also includes illustrations and instructions for putting on the robe and caring for it.

Field of Merit continued to influence later generations of people interested in the Buddhist robe. Sawaki Kōdō learned about the work from his teacher, Oka Sōtan 丘宗潭 (1860-1921) who often used Sōkō's text when he lectured on Dōgen's "Merit of the Kesa." In 1922 the publishing house, Morie Shōten, published "Merit of the Kesa" and *Field of Merit* bound together, based on an original text from Oka Sōtan's personal library. Both Sawaki and Hashimoto, following Oka's example, used the text when lecturing on the "Merit of the Kesa," and Sawaki had it republished in 1939.

Mokushitsu's *Correct Dharma Clothing* also drew together earlier research on the robe. Mokushitsu used a wider definition of Buddhist clothing (*hōe* 法衣), and included sections on the bowing mat (*zagu* 坐具); and the two robes that were worn under the rectangular *kesa*: the one-piece Chinese style robe with sleeves, collar and skirt that is called the *jikitotsu* 直綴 in Japanese, and the Japanese undergarment, *kimono* 着物. Throughout *Correct Dharma Clothing*, Mokushitsu emphasized the identity of the robe with the teachings of Buddhism. He and his collaborator, Gettan Zenryū 月潭禅竜 (?-1865), consulted with *vinaya* scholars in the Nagoya region, including Gōchō Kankai 豪潮寛海 (fl. 1822), a cleric of the Tendai Anraku *vinaya* school.[64]

Both of these texts sought to inform and correct what they saw as centuries of accumulated error about the Buddhist robe by referring to Dōgen's two essays that promote faith in the religious significance of the robe rather than strictly defining its form. Dōgen often used the device of delivering precise instructions followed by a proviso that the true robe is without set boundaries and is not limited to a particular form. For example, in the section on rag robes, Dōgen lists the kinds of fabric that the *vinaya* traditionally defined as appropriate for making rag robes, but he ends by saying that any

kind of cloth, even new cloth is suitable (DZZ 1.629). In another section he claims that since the robe is not limited or defined by its size, there is no contradiction in the teaching that Śākyamuni Buddha passed on his own robe to be held in trust for the future Buddha, Maitreya, whose physical size was believed to be much bigger than Śākyamuni (DZZ 1.636-637). Dōgen gives some practical instructions about the robe in these two fascicles but he does not explicitly define the manner of construction nor the dimensions of the garment. Presumably, he expected his followers to rely on the instructions in the Chinese translation of the *Four Part Vinaya* and Daoxuan's commentaries. Dōgen's use of the *vinaya* in regard to the *kesa* is not comprehensive. Rather, he tends to focus on those issues where Daoxuan's interpretation, in his estimation, has wandered away from Buddhist teachings, for example, the time limit for making robes, or whether silk is appropriate fabric for robes. This issue will be discussed more fully in chapter five.

Perhaps Dōgen was content to leave the details to the usual sources, but for Mokushitsu and Sōkō the detailed form of the robe was an important religious question that had to be researched carefully in the face of various external pressures. The *bakufu* insisted that Buddhist organizations standardize clerical dress. The *bakufu* also began to press for the use of formal robes in funeral services for the laity as well as other occasions. These robes, made of expensive and bright colors, to some degree followed the gaudy style of Chinese Ōbaku Zen robes, but were by no means limited to the Zen school (Kawaguchi 1984, 145). Mokushitsu and Sōkō's use of the *vinaya* and other sources to supplement the *Shōbō genzō*, therefore, was aimed at establishing a form of the robe that was as close as possible in detail to the teaching of the historical Buddha. By supplementing "Merit of the Kesa" and "Transmission of the Robe" fascicles with *vinaya* instructions they could maintain fidelity with Dōgen's teaching about the robe as an expression of the Buddha's wisdom while at the same time establishing guidelines for the physical robe.

Conclusion

The Tokugawa period was a time of great activity in *kesa* studies. Japanese Buddhists perceived the gulf between accepted Japanese custom regarding Buddhist robes and the prescriptions of the *vinaya* and awakened to the ideal of a *kesa* made and worn according to the rules of the *vinaya*. The first and perhaps most courageous step was to abandon the colored silk robes of their teachers and to limit themselves to cotton and linen robes in muted colors. Contemporary Westerners who view silk as a luxury item may view the extensive use of silk in Buddhist dress as evidence of a lack of appropriate monastic restraint. In East Asia, however, silk was not considered a luxury item and the use of cotton and linen was less common. This shift in outer appearance immediately set them apart from others by mutely declaring their intent to follow the rules of the *vinaya*. For this unusual step alone, *vinaya* reformers were both admired and later mocked, an indication of their success in at least raising awareness of the *vinaya* teachings about Buddhist robes.

The reformers' position that silk should not be used for Buddhist robes rests on Daoxuan's interpretation of the *vinaya*. Daoxuan's position is contradicted by the list of allowable fabrics for Buddhist robes that is contained in every Chinese *vinaya* text. It is an indication of the rigor of *kesa* studies in the Tokugawa period that people became more generally aware of the debate between Daoxuan and Yijing on this point and understood that Daoxuan's position was his own innovation. Daoxuan made the argument that silk should be avoided because he believed that the Mahāyāna demands a higher level of commitment to compassionate action. His position, however, strikes at the tolerant heart of *vinaya* rules that guide the interactions between monks and laity. Shōhen tactfully negotiated the contradictions and obscurities of this debate in his thorough essay, but it is easy to see how people with lesser skills would find the elements of this debate confusing. There was a clear danger that those who followed Daoxuan's

principle to the extreme would reach the Jain perspective that one must go to heroic lengths to avoid increasing one's bad karma by association with actions that create suffering even in silk worms. Rather than leading toward the bodhisattva principle of compassionate action towards others, the application of Daoxuan's teaching could also lead to self-absorbed intolerant behavior, as both lay and clerical critics of *vinaya* reformers noted. Or, to put it another way, the sincere attempt to follow *vinaya* rules became a practice of negativity and denial. How does the *kesa* "according to the *vinaya*" become a creative affirmation of Buddhist practice?

Jiun addressed this question in his thorough research and used this knowledge to teach others. I have deliberately avoided much of the intricate details of Jiun's understanding of the *kesa* in order to focus on how Jiun's followers implemented his teaching. His scholarship had a real religious and social impact by inspiring and empowering others to sew robes modeled on ancient textiles, to apply his teachings, and thus create the *dharma* by sewing robes.

The early period reformers saw the *vinaya* as a unifying principle in Buddhism, and their movement was open to clerics from different schools. Tokugawa *bakufu* policies, however, favored sectarian identities, and gradually this influenced the direction of *vinaya* studies. Reformers began to shape sectarian approaches to the interpretation of *vinaya* which led to fragmentation and a lack of a clear definition of the "robe according to the *dharma,*" as reflected in the secular work, *Ranks of All Schools.* The ideal of a unified model of behavior and dress was lost in the institutional emphasis on exactly differentiated practices. *Vinaya* reformers faced the problem of being seen as indifferent or disloyal to their lineage and even seeming un-Japanese if they overemphasized *vinaya* studies. If one privileges the ancient *vinaya* rules and spurns Japanese custom, one risks losing one's institutional and cultural identity.

Jiun continued to teach about the *vinaya* in his *True Dharma Vinaya* movement while incorporating Shingon teachings. Rather than exclusively relying on the *vinaya,* Jiun takes the masterful step of using Japanese icons and ancient textiles as reliable source material for his understanding of the Buddhist robe. He gives the textual prescriptions of the *vinaya* a physical form by using the evidence of ancient Japanese statues, maṇḍalas and textiles, and he helped actualize the *vinaya* through the hands of court ladies making *kesa.* Jiun's confidence in Japan as a Buddhist land was the strength behind his *vinaya* reform, and it is this confidence that evoked a creative response in his followers.

Dōgen was also convinced that Japan was a Buddhist land, but his approach to the *nyohō e* was informed by the Zen belief in the robe as a sign of transmission. Scholar-monks who looked to Dōgen's "Merit of the Kesa" and "Transmission of the Robe" for guidance about robes could not produce a definition of the Sōtō *nyohō e* based on these essays alone. Contrary to *vinaya* reformers, they turned to the *vinaya* only in order to clarify the teachings of Dōgen, their founder. The next chapter focuses on the concept of the *nyohō e* in Sōtō Zen, particularly as expressed by its twentieth century advocates, Sawaki Kōdō and Hashimoto Ekō.

---

1. The fascicle, "Transmission of the Robe," is number thirty-two of the seventy five fascicle version of the *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma* whose compilation is attributed to Ejō 懷奘 (1198-1280). "Transmission of the Robe" does not appear in the Twelve Fascicle new draft, rather "Merit of the Kesa" is included in this version. Much of the content of the two fascicle are similar, but there are significant differences in both topic and content.

2. Helen Baroni (2000, 167) argues that many of the *hattō* divided groups from

traditional alliances. She sees *hattō* regarding the purple robe as an attempt to separate the traditional alliance of Buddhist institutions and the ruling lineage.

3. The directive of 1613 addressed the bestowal of the purple robe on abbots at main temples of the Rinzai Zen school; the directive of 1615 extended it to main temples of all schools. For a discussion of the purple robe incident in English, see Duncan Williams (2000, 30-42) and Baroni (2000, 166-171). Williams gives a detailed account of the financial aspects. The Tokugawa government also exerted its authority over other colors such as red and gold that indicated rank. For this wider viewpoint, see Tamamuro Fumio (1971, 41; 1996, 12-14).

4. The history of Japanese Buddhist ordination, precepts receiving ceremonies and monastic regulations is a complex topic beyond the scope of this project. Here I am limiting the discussion to the perspective of *vinaya* reformers in the Tokugawa period. For them Eison and Kakujō's self-ordination precedent was the source of authority for their own movement.

5. For a detailed explanation of lay precepts assemblies in the Kamakura period see Paul Groner (2005, 210-235).

6. Ueda Reijō (1976, 24) refers to Myōnin's movement as a *vinaya* revival (*kōritsu* 興律). For a discussion of Eison's approach to receiving the precepts, see Groner (2005).

7. As discussed in chapter two, Tsunayoshi and his mother, Keishōin, organized an exhibit of Hōryūji treasures.

8. Gold brocade (*kinran* 金襴) *kesa* were introduced during the Kamakura period as transmission robes from Chinese masters in the Zen school (Izutsu 1965, 152).

During the seventeenth century the Ōbaku Zen school's use of elaborate *kinran kesa* affected both Rinzai and Sōtō Zen monks, many of whom trained with the Ōbaku masters. I will discuss the issue of gold brocade robes in the following chapter.

9. Also see Nishimura 2003b, 62a-63b. I have found no evidence that the anti-silk movement of the *vinaya* reformists grew out of a scarcity of silk. Rather, judging from the variety of types of silk weaving that are mentioned, silk cloth appears to have been abundant. The position against silk is usually presented as a reaction against the increasing use of luxury fabrics for *kesa*, especially the incorporation of gold brocade.

10. This interpretation is supported by a passage in the beginning of fascicle 7 of *Ten Recitations Vinaya* where the Buddha rules that having a new mat made up out of silk is a violation, but receiving it second hand is not (T 23.47c-48a).

11. Such fibers could only be wadded into felt and were not suitable for spinning. Shōhen briefly mentions the process of felting silk fiber from discarded cocoons, which he sometimes refers to as "wild silk," explaining that this technique is practiced by monks in Khotan (DNB 74.304).

12. See also fascicle seven of *Four Part Vinaya* for the context of this instruction (T 22.614a).

13. I have translated 繪衣 *kaie* as "silk robe," following the usage in Ueda's essay where the character e 繪 or "picture" also means silk, as many pictures were painted on silk.

14. Nishimura Ryō cites this one-fascicle text as *Lectures about the Decision to Prohibit Silk* (*Risshu kinshi ketsu kōgi* 律宗禁糸決講義), with a publication date of 1779. Tokuda (1968, 109) indicates that the preface states that it was recorded in 1711 by Kyōshu's disciple, Tenshin 天心 (fl. 1711).

15. The following biographical sketch relies on Watt (1982).

16. The first volume of JSZ is called *Shukan* 首巻, but in library catalogue entries it appears as volume 0. I will follow the latter convention.

17. On the negative side, Jiun admits that he found it difficult to understand Hōsen's speech, and that they had differences in their understanding. Nevertheless, he admired and was touched by Hōsen's teaching (JSZ 0.248-251). Jiun is also listed as number thirty-two of fifty-four monks who received dharma transmission (*shihō* 嗣法) from Hōsen (JSZ 0.94b).

18. Tokuda lists three separate works by Hōtan with variations on this title, and gives 1717 as the date of composition for this group, but Kawaguchi (1976, 354) lists the date as 1726.

19. For an explanation of my translation of the title of this work, see the discussion below.

20. Jiun studied the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* as an alternative to the *Four Part Vinaya*, in no small part because Kūkai had brought these texts to Japan and urged his followers to study it. See Clarke (2006) for an account of those who studied this *vinaya* during the Tokugawa period.

21. For its appearance in texts before Daoxuan, see T 4.47a; T 18.854b; T 34.598c. For

Daoxuan's usage see T 40.360b and 364c; and T 45.838a.

22. Several *kesa* sewing teachers explained to me that Jiun used this name for the *kesa* to indicate that changes in its form had made it necessary to reestablish the proper *kesa* as a rectangular garment. One of these changes, the "elephant trunk robe" distorts the upper edge of the *kesa* to make an exaggerated curve, or scooped out shape. See chapter five below for an extended discussion of this type of robe and its significance in the Sōtō Zen school.

23. Although the details of the *vinaya* allow as many as five garments (for nuns), the expression "three robes" represents the clothing of the monk as a category term. Because this term has strong associations with ascetic practice and adherence to monastic rules, "three robes" also evokes the time when Buddha lived and interacted with his disciples, the ideal time to which the *vinaya* and scriptures refer. Jiun's use of this compound to replace *civara* is idiosyncratic. A similar compound, *hōe* 方衣 occurs more frequently, but includes more than the three robes, extending to extra robes or cloth kept in reserve to buy medicine, or to the extra robes and the Chinese underskirt (*kun* 裙). For examples of these usages see: fasc. 18, *Five Part Vinaya* (T 22.124b); and *Sanskrit dictionary* (*Honbon go* 翻梵語; T 54.1051b). In the Taisho edition of the Buddhist canon, neither compound is used exclusively to refer to the three robes, and both include a wider range of cloth, clothing and mats.

24. For Jiun's discussion of the term *civara*, see JSZ 3.339.

25. See also *Inner Meaning*, JSZ 2.150-151

26. In 2004 I received a xerox copy of the woodblock print of *Garments of the Way*

compiling Jiun's collected works. I do not, however, have the front page as illustrated in Osaka bijutsu (2004, 152.reference 1). These eleven illustrations appear in JSZ 1.22-32.

27. Note that the "three kingdoms" of the Zenkōji statue includes Paekche, a kingdom in the southeast region of the Korean peninsula.

28. The major exhibits of the Zenkōji statue took place in 1694 and 1702-1706, before Jiun was born, but the impact of these travelling exhibits would still have been felt in his time. It is likely that he is working from drawings or reproductions of these statues. Jiun's resources and his perspective on these art works will have to await further research. For further information about the Zenkōji icon and its place in Japanese religious life see McCallum (1994); for information about the Seiryōji Buddha, see Henderson and Hurvitz (1956).

29. For example, Jiun comments about the difficulty of studying hidden images, particularly in the case of the Zenkōji Amida Buddha and is well aware of the proliferation of different images of this statue in various regions. He makes some attempts to compare these different versions. It will require more research to understand which were the actual images or copies of images that Jiun used. For a discussion of hidden images see

30. For other examples of this style of holding the *kesa* with the left hand, see the image of a preaching Śākyamuni Buddha, c. 794, in Meher McArthur (2002, 112; figure 4); and an especially clear example in an 8th century image of Śākyamuni preaching at Vulture Peak, in cave 17 at Dunhuang in Fisher (1993, 109; plate 99).

31. A more detailed explanation awaits further research. In general, Jiun's use of sources throughout this illustrated section is quite complex as he weighs various explanations from the *vinaya*, Daoxuan's *Vinaya Revelations*, and commentaries of the esoteric master, Śubhakarasiṃha. In these depictions of eminent teachers Jiun takes on challenging problems in the interpretation of the *kesa* as depicted in art.

32. Kūkai brought *Commentary on the Mahāvairocana Sūtra* 大日經疏back from China. It is also referred to as the *Daisho* 大疏 or the *Muisho* 無畏疏.

33. For a description and diagram of this gesture see McArthur (2002, 114-115).

34. This is one transliteration of the Sanskrit term, nivāsana, which means innermost robe. The *Four Part Vinaya* transliterates the term as *nehan sō* 涅槃僧.

35. The closest reference in the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* is in fascicle 35, which describes the disposition of the body of the reclining monk who lies on his right side with his right hand below his head for a pillow. Jiun's discussion here is mainly concerned with how monks lie down, and how their practice is maintained while resting. In *Inner Meaning*, Jiun cites the description in the *Four Part Vinaya* of Śākyamuni Buddha donning layers of robes as the night grew colder (T 22.856c-857a; JSZ 2.199). This passage, however, refers to sitting, not lying down. More research is necessary to clarify Jiun's position on this issue and his views on the use of silk in robes. The robes made by his community primarily used linen and cotton, even making linen thread by unraveling portions of the cloth. Silk was also used in some of the robes, but only when supplementary cloth was needed (see discussion of *Thousand Robes* below).

36. Rikyō was originally a vassal in the domain of Yanagisawa Yasumitsu 柳沢保光 (1752-1817) of Ko'oriyama 郡山 in Yamato (Washū 和州), but he was much older than Yasumitsu. Yasumitsu later became Jiun's foremost lay disciple, eventually taking the tonsure and adopting the name Onmyō 飲明 (JSZ 0.145-147). It is not clear to me what the relationship between Rikyō and Yasumitsu was.

37. The *sōgishi* is a kind of shirt with a collar and sleeves, but it is open in the back. The construction is simple: two rectangular pieces of cloth more than twice the length of the torso are joined by a collar that is sewn onto half the length of each of the rectangular cloths. The back is left unsewn, and the wearer overlaps the front pieces, securing them with ties. The *sōgishi* is worn with a simple wrap around skirt called the *kun* 裙 made out of a single length of pleated cloth with ties. For a photograph of the Japanese version of these garments see Izutsu (1974, plate 17). Historically, these two garments for the upper and lower body respectively preceded the full body garment called *jikitotsu* 直綴, developed during the Song period. For this reason, they are considered to be closer to the garments indicated by the *vinaya.* The *sōgishi* and *kun* garments are still worn by monks training at Mt. Kōya (per conversation with Kanamori at Chōeiji in July, 2005; see footnote 52 below).

38. The pale brown color of these illustrations nearly matches the brown shade of many of the extant *kesa* made in the thousand robe project of Jiun's followers.

39. In contrast, for example, Dōgen is never depicted wearing a rag robe, in spite of his high regard for this garment. For an extensive study of the *kesa* in depictions of Dōgen see Sekiguchi (1992).

40. A similar painting with bright colors of red, blue white and green is held by the Osaka Historical Museum 大阪歴史博物館 (Osaka bijutsu 2004, 38; plate 9).

41. At least one example that uses features of both styles can be seen in a painting stored at Chōfukuji 長福寺 in Kyōto. It is entitled "Seated meditation on a crag at Two Dragon Hut (Sōryū an giwajō zazen zō 双龍菴巌上坐禅像)," and is by an unknown artist (JSZ 0.fig. 1). It depicts a mature but still young Jiun sitting meditation with a few days growth of beard. He wears a bright multi-colored pieced robe, whose running stitches can plainly be seen. The *kesa* is worn over the left shoulder, unlike most of the paintings discussed so far. Jiun is seated on the sitting mat with the two corners and the border clearly showing, similar to Rikyō's painting. The existence of this kind of crossover style suggests that much more work needs to be done before firm conclusions can be reached about the significance of these two styles.

42. Official recognition of the *True Dharma Vinaya* movement was granted by the government in 1786. See Watt (1982, 87).

43. Shingen was the head of studies (*gakuzu* 学頭) at Mt. Koya who had encouraged other Shingon monks to study the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* (Ueyama 2004, 56). See also Clarke (2006): 13; n. 52. Jiun's commentary on this *vinaya* occupies nearly one whole volume of his collected works: JSZ 4.39-555.

44. Hase reports that this second copy was found at Chōfukuji in Kyōto (JSZ 17.73).

45. Gomyō refers to Jōshō as Zen'ni Shōkō 禪尼照公 (JSZ 16.29). The data about this robe is somewhat contradictory. Although Gomyō attributes the robe to Jōshō, neither this name nor Zen'ni appears in entry number one of *Thousand Robes*,

which only records the names of two nuns, Enichi and Gibon, as assistant sewers.

46. Hase (JSZ 16.238-239) gives the following data about the amount of Jiun's writing: volume one has a few places, volume two is entirely written by Jiun, volume three has one sheet of Jiun's writing, volume four is half in Jiun's writing, and volume five is recorded entirely by the nuns.

47. The following gaps appear in the record: ten robes in 1773, numbers 261-270; eight robes in 1789, numbers 418-425; four robes in 1802, numbers 851-854; and nine robes in 1803, numbers 873-881.

48. Gomyō also goes by the name of Teijū 諦濡. Gomyō became the third abbot of Keirinji, and later also became abbot of Amida dera. For a biographical sketch that includes Jiun's remarks on Gōmyō's transmission, see Ueyama (2004, 141-142.)

49. The term *sai* 齋 which I translate here as "observing the precepts" has multiple meanings in the Buddhist context and can also mean refraining, especially from food; purifying ones behavior and thoughts through repentance; and a Buddhist feast.

50. These verses were discussed in chapter two: "Though our mountains and rivers are in separate realms/ Our wind and moon are under the same heaven/ These gifts are for the disciples of the Buddha/ That we may be joined together by common ties."

51. I have not yet found a corroborating passage for this story about Emperor Taizong giving "rag robes" to his troops. If he had, it is far more likely that a record of this incident would use the more ambiguous term, pieced robe or *nōe* 衲衣. If he read of such an incident, Gomyō might well have interpreted pieced robe (*nōe* 衲衣) to

mean rag robe (*funzōe* 糞掃衣).

52. The full verse reads: How great is the robe of liberation/ A formless field of merit/ Wearing the precepts of the Tathāgata/ Extends to all sentient beings (*dai zai gedda pukku, musō fukuden e, hibu nyoraikai kōdoshoshūjō* 大哉解脱服、無相福田衣、披奉如来戒、広度諸衆生). See chapter five below for a discussion of Dōgen's interpretation of these verses

53 Among the first fifty robes produced in the years 1766-1773, for example, the types of robes are: twenty eight *uttarasō* seven panel robes, eight *man'e*; three *sogyari'e* of thirteen to twenty five panels; one *andae* five panel robe (the first robe), and two *funzōe* rag robes without the number of panels recorded.

54. During 2004-2005 I made several trips to Chōeiji to study the *kesa* stored there with the assistance of Kanamori Shōkō 金森正晃, a Shingon priest, and Matsumura Kaoruko 松村薫子, a fellow researcher.

55. The *vinaya* makes an exception for the rag robe which may have as many as four layers of fabric depending on the strength of the worn pieces of fabric with which it is made.

56. Some Sōtō Zen sewing teachers, citing Dōgen's objections of some of Daoxuan's teachings about the *kesa*, argue that this technique is not "according to the *dharma*." The topic of Dōgen's criticism of Daoxuan is discussed in more detail in chapter five.

57. Permission to view the robes on this occasion was arranged by the Sōtō Zen nun, Nakayama Dōse 中山道世, with the help of Kuruma Shōgyō 来馬正行, the abbot of Kannon'in 観音院 in Musashisakai, a suburb of Tokyo. Permission to view the

kesa is at the discretion of the abbot of Kokiji who makes his own selection of the *kesa.*

58. Gomyō also wrote that the number of the *kesa* would also be written on it, but unfortunately this was not put into practice.

59. The full four character phrase, *ehō ichinyo*, does not appear in Dogen's writings. Dōgen uses *ehō*, to indicate transmission of the teaching and the robe. (DZZ 1.623). I have included it here because this four character phrase often appears as a teaching in modern *kesa* sewing groups. See also "ehō" in ZGD, 104a.

60 The main teachers in this group were Zuikō Chingyū 瑞岡珍牛 (1743-1822) of Banshōji 萬松寺, and Kōsen Mujaku 黄泉無著 (1775-1838) of Daikōin 大光院, both of whom encouraged Mokushitsu Ryōyō and Sōkō Raizen to provide a guide to Dōgen's teachings on the robe. See Kawaguchi (1984, 5-12).

61. The following discussion summarizes Kawaguchi (1984, 5-12).

62. These texts will be introduced in chapter five.

63. Although only twenty five pages in the modern edition, the text contains seventy five citations from thirty-four different texts. See Kawaguchi (1984, 11).

64. The Anraku Ritsu movement was initiated by Myōryū 妙立 (1637-1690) in 1672. For a history of this group see Ishida (1963, 455-482). For a list of Mokushitsu's colleagues who worked on the text see Kawaguchi (2002, 270).

Chapter Five

Development of Sōtō Zen Orthodoxies in Regard to the *Kesa*

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I discussed inherent tensions between the movement to revive *vinaya* rules and allegiance to the traditional robe practice of one's own school. As the reform of robes developed, however, *vinaya* practitioners were viewed by the government as a subset within each school. In addition, the government recognized and ratified differences in how each school defined the "robe according to the *dharma*." In this chapter I turn to the complex problem of how Sōtō Zen clerics understood the "robe according to the *dharma*." Unlike other schools, Sōtō Zen did not achieve a clear rapprochement between traditionalists and reformers, in part because of the increasing emphasis on Dōgen as the source of authority.

For Sōtō Zen clerics the issue of monastic reform was complicated by the textual tradition of Zen pure rules (*shingi* 清規) and by Dōgen's own writings about monastic practice. This meant that the interpretation of the *kesa* included *vinaya* study as well as the mixture of Chinese social practices and *vinaya* rules that was characteristic of the Chan school (Yifa 2005, 124-125). In fact, *vinaya* study itself was suspect in Sōtō to a greater degree than in other schools. Clerics of the Shingon school could be certain that studying *vinaya* was a fundamental practice of their school because Kūkai had introduced the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* to Japan. In contrast, Dōgen's writings suggest an ambivalent or even neglectful relationship to *vinaya* teachings, preferring to develop his own interpretations and introduce new practices.

After a brief discussion of Dōgen's particular approach to *vinaya* teachings about the *kesa* this chapter takes up problems in the interpretation of Dōgen's teachings about

the robe that were hotly contested during the mid-eighteenth century. These debates set the stage for a major struggle in the Sōtō Zen school during the late Tokugawa period called the "three robe controversy" that resulted in an atmosphere of conflict about the *kesa* that continued into the modern era. In the last part of the chapter I discuss how Sawaki Kōdō and Hashimoto Ekō popularized and expanded the nascent *nyohō e* movement during the twentieth century through their popular lectures and their conviction that sewing the Buddha's robe is an essential practice for lay and priest alike.

Part One. Dōgen and the *Kesa*: *Vinaya* Rules and Dōgen Rules

Dōgen developed his approach toward the *kesa* from Zen literature as well as *vinaya* and scriptures, negotiating among these different perspectives to arrive at his own interpretation of the meaning of the *kesa*, its rules and procedures.[1] As discussed in chapter three, Dōgen begins with the premise that the true *kesa* has not yet been introduced to Japan. In "Merit of the *Kesa*" he argues that in Japan, far removed from the birthplace of Buddhism both temporally and spatially, monks shave their head and beard and call themselves the disciple of the Buddha, but they do not receive and care for the *kesa*, nor believe that this is essential. In addition, they do not know the material, color or measure of the *kesa* nor how to wear it. It is an impassioned passage that boldly contradicts the plain fact that in thirteenth century Japan Dōgen was surrounded by monks wearing *kesa*. According to Dōgen, however, none of these monks knew about *kesa* nor wore them, implying by his rhetoric that they did not know the true *kesa*.

Dōgen's notion of the true *kesa* is not limited to the prescriptions of *vinaya* texts, the Mahāyāna precepts found in the *Fanwan jing*, nor the pure rules. He respects these teachings and expects them to guide the practice of his monks, but he also creates rules

and practices that are not found in any of these texts, usually prescribing ritual actions of reverence toward the *kesa*. The following discussion looks at three examples of Dōgen's approach: his rules for washing the *kesa*, the verses that Dōgen refers to as the *kesa* vow, and whether to use silk to make robes.[2]

Fascicle six of the *Four Part Vinaya* describes the circumstances that led to the rule for washing robes (T 22.607b). A monk went to visit a nun of his acquaintance who was not a relative. She noticed that his five panel robe was dirty and offered to wash it for him, whereupon he removed the robe and handed it over to her. Direct contact with this garment, soiled with the emissions of his body, caused the nun to become pregnant. This euphemistic account establishes the only rule for washing the *kesa* found in the *Four Part Vinaya*. There are no rules prescribing how to wash the robe, and the story takes it for granted that monks commonly ask a female to wash their robes. The rule addresses the danger of having a woman other than a kinswoman washing one's robes, so although ostensibly about robes, the intent of the rule is to control male-female interactions.

Daoxuan, however, is concerned with the practical details of washing one's robes. In his *Deportment of Buddhist Robes* he explains that if the robe loses its dye during washing it must be re-dyed. He explains that being without a robe during this period is not a violation (T 45.838c). He gives further instructions that the bucket for washing robes should not be used for washing one's feet, nor should one wash the robe by crumpling it up with one's feet or hands (T 45.870b). Although Daoxuan includes details that are not in the *vinaya* text, his instructions, like the *vinaya*, are mainly prohibitions.

In contrast, Dōgen presents *kesa* washing as a ritual act. In "Merit of the *Kesa*" Dōgen describes a detailed procedure that incorporates bowing and chanting (DZZ 1.631). The unfolded *kesa* should be washed in a solution made from incense boiled in water, or from ashes soaked in water. Without wringing the cloth, one simply allows it to

rest in the solution for an hour. The *kesa* is then rinsed in cool water scented with incense and hung over a clean pole to dry. When it is quite dry, one takes it off the pole and puts it on a high shelf. Lighting incense and scattering flowers, one circumambulates the *kesa*, keeping it to the right side of one's body, and bows three, six or nine times. Then with palms together one lifts the *kesa* up with both hands and chants the *kesa* vow verses. In this example, Dōgen goes beyond the mainly prohibitive precedents in *vinaya* literature and commentary to create a method for washing the *kesa* that expresses reverence toward the garment.

The *kesa* vow verses used in the washing ritual above is another example of Dōgen's innovation. He explains that while practicing in China under Rujing, he heard his neighbor on the meditation platform chanting these verses before donning his *kesa*. Dōgen was so moved that tears streamed down his face. It is difficult to tell from his account whether this was a single occasion or a daily event in the monastery. Could it be, as Dōgen implies, that the practice of chanting these verses was incorporated into the daily practice of Chan monasteries during the Song period?

The verses appear in the Chinese procedures for ordination that Daoxuan indicates in his *Practice and Service Comments*. The ordination master recites these verses when he presents the *kesa* to the ordinee (fasc. 28; T 40.150b). Chan monastic codes adopted this practice, as nearly identical verses are prescribed for the same part of ordination ritual in the twelfth century *Pure Rules for Chan Monasteries* (fasc. 9, *Chanyuan qinggui* 禪苑清規; in Kagamishima 1972, 305); and in the Yuan era *Revision of Baizhang Zen Monastic Regulations* (*Chixiu Baizhang qinggui* 敕修百丈清規, T48. no. 2025) compiled by Dongyang Dehui 東陽德輝 in 1338 (T 48. 1137b).[3] In Daoxuan's other works on the *kesa*, however, he does not describe chanting these verses as part of one's daily practice.[4] Dōgen claims, however, that he observed this practice during his study

at Rujing's monastery and recommends chanting these verses in daily reverence toward the *kesa.*

Finally, the third example looks at how Dōgen handles Daoxuan's teaching that one should not use silk for robes. Dōgen first changes the basis of the argument from a *vinaya* question to a Zen dialogue between master and disciple:

> Long ago a monk asked the old Buddha, "Was the transmission robe [given] on Plum Mountain in the middle of the night cotton or silk, or was it, after all, any kind of thing?" The old Buddha said, "It is not cotton, it is not silk." You should know that the *kesa* is neither silk nor cotton. This is the essential training of the Buddha's way.
> ある僧かつて古佛にとふ黄梅夜半の傳衣これ布なりよやせん絹なりとやせん、畢竟じてなにものなりとかせん。古佛いはく、これ布にあらず、これ絹にあらず。しるべし袈裟は絹布にあらざる、これ佛道の玄訓なり。
> (DZZ 1.629).[5]

Here, Dōgen distinguishes between the material aspect of the *kesa* and its meaning. The *kesa* is not made of silk or cotton, it is not large or small. Any physical feature that one can posit is not the true *kesa*, an argument that Dōgen also uses to solve the problem of whether Śākyamuni's *kesa* that is held in trust by Mahākāśyapa will fit the larger frame of the future Buddha, Maitreya (DZZ 1.636).

In his discussion of the rag robe Dōgen also emphasizes that choosing between cotton and silk is not the way of the Buddha:

> You should know that among the rags you pick up, there is cotton that resembles silk, and there is silk that resembles cotton. There are myriad distinctions in customs, and it is difficult to measure natural change. This is what the physical eye does not well understand. You must not debate about everything that you get

as silk or cotton, rather, you must call it rags.

しるべし、糞掃をひろふなかに、絹に相似なる布あらん、布に相似なる絹あらん。土俗萬差にして、造化はかりがたし。肉眼のよくしるところにあらず。かくのごとくものをえたらん、絹．布と論ずべからず、糞掃と称すべし。(DZZ 1.629)

Dōgen uses the different circumstances of how the fabric is acquired to suggest a state of mind that does not discriminate. As we saw in the *vinaya*, the rules governing materials for the rag robe focus on the former circumstances of the cloth, not the type of fiber. Although Dōgen mentions the list, the majority of his discussion is about not discriminating and he suggests that both silk and cotton should be called "rags." By focusing on the silk versus cotton debate in the context of rag robes, Dōgen suggests that perhaps the non-discriminating mind that picks up rags without concern for the fiber would be appropriate in all circumstances, including monastic robes. Dōgen does not go as far as abandoning the ancient distinction between rag robes made of discarded cloth and monastic robes made of donated cloth, but he does insist that rag robes are "most pure" (DZZ 1.637).

As these examples show, Dōgen created rituals expressing reverence for the *kesa* in cases where the *vinaya* or pure rules appeared to be lacking in this regard. As I discussed in chapter three, Kamakura Buddhists believed that during the period of the decline of the Buddhist teaching the merit of the *kesa* continues unaffected, in the end becoming the only sign of the Buddha's teaching. For Dōgen, reverence for the *kesa* is the same as reverence toward the Buddha.

This brings us to the final point of how Dōgen identifies the *kesa* with the Buddha's teaching. In the fascicle *Dharani,* Dōgen states:

Being covered by Śākyamuni Buddha's robe, one is covered by the robes of all the Buddhas in the ten directions. Being covered by Śākyamuni's robe is to be covered by the *kesa.* The *kesa* is the banner of the Buddhist assembly...

For example, when one bows to countless *kalpas* of ancient Buddhas and present Buddhas, this is the moment of being covered by the robe of the Buddha. When people cover their bodies with the *kesa* they have already attained Śākyamuni Buddha's fleshly body, hands, feet, head, eyes, marrow, and brains, and become the shining transmission of the wheel of the *dharma*. Each time one puts on the *kesa,* this is manifesting the merit of wearing the *kesa*.

釋迦牟尼佛衣所覆は、為十方一切佛衣之所覆なり。為釋迦牟尼佛衣所覆は、為袈裟之所覆なり。袈裟は標識の佛衆なり。

たとひ無量億千劫に古佛今佛を禮拜する、これ釋迦牟尼佛衣之所覆時節なり。ひとたび袈裟を身体におほふは、すでにこれ得釋迦牟尼佛之身肉手足、頭目髓脳、光明傳法輪なり。かくのごとくして袈裟を著するなり、これ現成著袈裟功徳なり。 (DZZ 1.423).

Although Dōgen begins rather conventionally with the statement that the *kesa* is the garment worn by all Buddhas and the appellation of the *kesa* as the "banner of Buddhism," he soon shifts toward identifying the *kesa* with the body of the Buddha. In chapter three above I discussed the identification of the *kesa* with the body of the Buddha in connection with the five vows of Śākyamuni in the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture.*[6] Dōgen's interpretation was that the *kesa* becomes the physical manifestation of the bodhisattva's five vows, just as Śākyamuni's own body is a physical manifestation of his bodhisattva vows. Each time one dons the *kesa,* therefore, one recreates the former vows of Śākyamuni Buddha, thereby creating the body of the Buddha. In promoting the ritual

of chanting the robe vow verses Dōgen reinforces the awareness that each time one puts on the robe, one completes the bodhisattva's vow.

Part Two. Sōtō school debates about the *kesa* during the Tokugawa period

Tokugon Yōson 徳厳養存 (fl. 1640-1730) was the first Sōtō cleric to write a substantial essay about the *kesa* during the Tokugawa period.[7] In 1703, the same year that Yōson wrote his work on the *kesa*, Manzan Dōhaku 卍山道白 (1636-1715) had successfully petitioned the government for a compromise between two approaches to succession in the Sōtō school: the single dharma lineage (between one master and one disciple); and the temple lineage succession in which each new abbot was adopted into the lineage of that temple (Bodiford 1991, 447-450). Yōson was surely aware of these issues when he wrote *Thoughts on the Kesa of the Buddhas and Ancestors* (*Busso kesa kō* 佛祖袈裟考). In the beginning of the work, Yōson uses the literary device of a guest expressing his doubts about the manner in which *kesa* are worn in his day:

> Recently I have seen the clothes that monks [bhikṣus] wear. There is something called the bestowing of the purple [robe] and wearing the purple robe which I say is a deviation of the teaching. And there are those who wear crimson robes or the *shutara* braided cord ties that drape down in the back...
>
> There are even silk robes and monk's robes of beautiful brocade, worn according to one's taste. I ask you, these kinds of styles, are they based on the Buddha's rules or are they deviations?
>
> 頃日。苾蒭著衣者見。賜紫稱する、而も紫衣被者有。宗途稱。而も緋衣著。或修多羅處背上結垂。。。

乃至蠶衣僧服華綺綾羅。意任而著。是等之式。佛制宗途依而分乎。(ZSSZ Shingi, 2.524a)[8]

In this opening passage Yōson criticizes practices that he considers antithetical to the Buddha's teaching. He does not, however, continue with a discussion of the *vinaya* rules. He soon moves on to specific questions about the robe in Zen teachings.

Yōson uses a question and answer format and is primarily concerned with the transmission of the robe, asking what is the meaning of the transmission of the robe from Śākyamuni to Mahākāśyapa; was this robe the golden (*kinran* 金襴) robe or was it a rag robe; and will the nearly human sized robe of Śākyamuni fit the larger frame of Maitreya? These issues are addressed through citations from Indian, Chinese and Japanese sources (ZSSZ 2.523-547).[9] Yōson shows little concern with the merit of the robe in the period of *mappō*, nor is he particularly interested in legends about the miraculous powers of the *kesa*. Instead, he cites texts that would be of interest to Zen practitioners, discussing Zen *kōan* and following the chronology of transmission stories about the robe, for example, the story of Hui-neng's "heavy" robe. In the Japan section Yōson writes at some length about lay people wearing *kesa*, an issue that Dōgen raises in his "Merit of the *Kesa*" and "Transmission of the Robe" (ZSSZ 2.539a and 541a). Finally, Yōson presents an account of the thousand robes that Nagaya-Ō sent to China and the effect of this gift on Ganjin's decision to travel to Japan. He then reveals that in 1702 Tanshin 丹心 (fl. 1660) bestowed on him one of a thousand great robes (*fu sōgyari kesa* 布僧伽梨袈裟) that Ganjin had brought with him to Japan and had been preserved at Tōshōdaiji after Ganjin's death (ZSSZ 2.545-546). He does not indicate that this robe was a transmission robe from Tanshin.[10] Yōson's work is notable for bringing a Zen perspective to *kesa* studies, and he is particularly interested in the transmission robe, but he also shows a wide knowledge of scriptural references to the robe. Dōgen's works on

the *kesa* are mentioned, but they are not the primary focus. Fifty years later, Sōtō writings on the *kesa* had shifted to emphasize Dōgen's thought.

In 1759 Gyakusui Tōryū 逆水洞流 (1684-1766), abbot of Daijōji since 1750, published *Chapter on Elephant Trunk Transmission Robe* (*Den'e Zōbi shōkō* 傳衣象鼻章稿, ZSSZ Shingi, vol. 2; hereafter *Elephant Trunk Robe*) in the midst of increasing interest among clerics in the Sōtō school to "return to the old ways" *fukko* 復古 (Kawaguchi 1976, 364-365).[11] Tōryū had received *dharma* transmission from Chito Shōgen 智燈照玄 (1665-1735), who had studied with two of the main proponents of this reform movement, Gesshū Sōchō 月舟宗胡 (1618-1696) and Manzan Dōhaku. Gesshū and Manzan established their interpretation of monastic rules at Daijōji 大乘寺, referred to as *kiku daijō* 規矩大乘, by combining the teachings of Dōgen and Keizan.[12] Tōryū was thus a descendant of a lineage that was committed to reviving the old rules of the Sōtō school and putting these rules into practice at Daijōji and affiliated temples.

In 1764 Tōryū wrote *Critique of "Questions about Ordination"* (*Tokudo wakumon bengi shō* 得度或門辨儀章, ZSSZ Zenkai, vol. 1) in which he criticized the position taken by Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769) that novice precepts were a necessary guide for the behavior of new monks and should be given in addition to the bodhisattva precepts. Tōryū's argument was that the novice precepts ceremony was added by the Chinese monk, Jakuen 寂圓 (1207-1299), and was therefore not part of Dōgen's teaching (Riggs 2002, 188). In the case of ordination Tōryū used an historical argument, but for the *kesa* Tōryū takes an entirely different approach.

In *Elephant Trunk Robe* Tōryū uses one sentence from Dōgen's "Transmission of the Robe" and his own observations about Buddha images and *kesa* in Japan to arrive at a definition of the proper form of the transmission robe. This approach seems similar to Jiun's method which combined textual interpretations with an examination of culturally

significant Buddhist art and *kesa* artifacts. Instead of Jiun's reliance on *vinaya* texts and his wide reading in Buddhist literature, however, Tōryū emphasizes Dōgen as the main authority. Dōgen's sentence in "Transmission of the Robe" reads: "Now the once-received robe, the nine type robe, must be properly transmitted based on the Buddhadharma. いま一頂衣・九品衣、まさしく佛法より正伝せり *ima itchō e, kuhon e, masashiku buppō yori shōden seri* (DZZ 1.287)."[13] Tōryū interprets "nine type robe" to mean a single nine-panel robe. Although he is aware that "nine type robe" could equally refer to the nine categories of great robe explained in both the *vinaya* and in Dōgen's "Merit of the *Kesa*," he argues that Bodhidharma's nine panel robe, that is, the iconic Zen transmission *kesa*, includes all of these nine types of robe (ZSSZ 2.608a; and 609a).

Tōryū also claims that the legitimate robe of transmission is what he calls the elephant trunk robe or *zōbi e* 象鼻衣. Tōryū admits that Dōgen did not use this term but, without clearly defining its physical characteristics, he posits that this kind of robe must have been the form of the *kesa* passed down in the Zen lineage: "From the lineage of Shaolin [Bodhidharma] passed down from old, the transmitted great robe is properly called the elephant trunk 少林門下從往古自伝大衣正象鼻称 (ZSSZ 605b)." Tōryū's conviction that the so-called elephant trunk robe is the transmission robe probably derives from his knowledge of *kesa* extant in Sōtō temples, an issue that I will take up below. First, however, it is important to look at Tōryū's methodology and ideas.

Kawaguchi (1976, 368 and 371) writes that Tōryū made up the term "elephant trunk robe" based on the manner in which the *kesa* on the Buddha statue at Seiryōji and other statues hangs down in the front and the back. As we saw in chapter four, Jiun analyzed the *kesa* worn over both shoulders in the Seiryōji and the Zenkōji Buddha images, noting that the bottom hem of the *kesa* in the Seiryōji figure is parallel with the

ground, whereas the Zenkōji Buddha shows one corner of the *kesa* hanging down in front of the body in an inverted triangle. Jiun interpreted the difference in the hem of the *kesa* as a way of distinguishing images of Śākyamuni from those of Amida. In contrast with Jiun's careful reading of the drapery on the Seiryōji Śākyamuni, Tōryū's comment seems more ideological than analytic:

> I, an old patched [monk], have seen in person the Saga [Seiryōji] Śākyamuni statue and other Buddha and bodhisattva statues in present day Japan. They all wear the *kesa* on both shoulders. The top corners of the *kesa* hang down in front and back. [The *kesa*] covers the left and right underarm and shoulders and encircles the whole body. It is therefore the construction of the Buddha's *kesa*. These all correspond to the full elephant trunk once received robes. One must wear the *kesa* with the deportment of the Buddhas and Bodhisattvas.
>
> 老衲會見嵯峨釋迦尊像並扶桑國中現在佛菩薩像觀。皆同在通肩披。前頭後頭袈裟角。左右臂肩繞全身圍。然則佛袈裟之製様。皆全象鼻一頂衣當。然佛菩薩搭袈裟威儀可不。(ZSSZ 2. 612b).

Tōryū values the Seiryōji Buddha statue as evidence of the garments worn by Śākyamuni Buddha, but does not go into detail about the other Japanese statues he has viewed. Rather, this statue confirms his hypothesis and he concludes that the Buddha wore an "elephant trunk robe" without taking the time to prove his point through evidence and analysis.

Tōryu declares that there are full and half size elephant trunk robes (ZSSZ 2.606b). Throughout the text Tōryū uses a set phrase for the size of the robe as ten *hō* (*jippō* 十方) horizontal; and three *sai* (*sansai* 三際) vertical, a description that sounds like a figurative use of the Buddhist terms for everywhere (ten directions) and all time (the

three times of past present and future).[14] Kawaguchi (1976, 371), however, interprets Tōryū's description as referring to measurable size, and calculates that Tōryū's measurements would produce a robe 1.5 meters vertical by 3 meters horizontal.[15] In comparison, the prescription for measurements of the three robes in fascicle forty-one of the *Four Part Vinaya* uses the individual's measurements from elbow to fist (or extended hand) called the *chū* 肘 in Japanese. Robes are to be no larger than three by five arm lengths for the seven panel and great robe, and no smaller than two by four arm lengths for the five panel robes (T 22.863a).[16] A *kesa* using measurements from an average person would produce a robe that is approximately 1.25 meters vertical by 2 meters horizontal. The elephant trunk robe is therefore only slightly longer vertically, but it is fifty percent wider horizontally. Since Tōryū did not give detailed descriptions about the *kesa* he saw, these calculations cannot be confirmed.

It is unlikely, given Tōryū's position on the *vinaya,* that he would have consulted Jiun's *Garments of the Way* which was written in 1751, three years before Tōryū wrote his first draft of *Elephant Trunk Robe.* Tōryū considers that Japanese studies of *vinaya* teachings about the *kesa* are mistaken because they accept the teachings of Daoxuan's lineage. For Tōryū these teachings are particularly inappropriate for the dharma transmission robe. In the first place, Daoxuan's interpretation of the *kesa* must be completely rejected if one is to follow Dōgen. In addition, he believes that the *dharma* transmission *kesa* is the true model for all *kesa.*

On the first point, Tōryū cites Dōgen's criticism in "Merit of the *Kesa*" that *kesa* made by *vinaya* adherents were unduly influenced by Daoxuan and his innovations (ZSSZ 2.615a). The passage from Dōgen states:

> Therefore, those who have aroused the mind of awakening, if they receive and wear *kesa*, then it must be a properly transmitted *kesa*, and one must not receive

and wear one that is made in a new way according to a single individual's conception. The properly transmitted *kesa* is the lineage of transmission from Bodhidharma and Huineng, the face to face transmission of the Tathāgata, without a break in the succession of generations. It was worn by their *dharma* heirs and it is the properly transmitted *kesa*. The new way of making it from Tang [China] is not the proper transmission. Now, as of old, the *kesa* worn by monks and their followers from India all wear them according to the proper transmission of the Buddhas and ancestors. Not one of them wears a *kesa* which is made according to the new Chinese way. They are the ones in the dark, those who believe in the *kesa* of the *vinaya* scholars. Those who have come into the light abandon it.

しかあればすなはちいま發心のともがら、袈裟を受持すべくば、正傳の袈裟を受持すべし、今案の新作袈裟を受持すべからず。正傳の袈裟といふは、少林．曹溪正傳しきたれる、如來の嫡嫡相承なり、一代も虧闕なし。それ法子法孫の著しきたれる、これ正傳袈裟なり、唐土の新作は正傳にあらず。いま古今に、西天よりきたれる僧徒の所着の袈裟、みな佛祖正傳の袈裟のごとく著せり。一人としても、いま震旦新作の律學のともがらの所製の袈裟のごとくなるなし。くらきともがら、律學の袈裟を信ず、あきらかならものは抛却するなり。(DZZ 1.627)

In this passage Dōgen distinguishes Daoxuan's interpretation of the physical form of the *kesa* from what he calls the properly transmitted *kesa* of Mahākāśyapa and Bodhidharma.

Dōgen criticizes the questionable methodology in *Vinaya Revelations* where Daoxuan argues against the use of silk and creates a new way of making the backing for a great robe.[17] Dōgen makes it clear that he is not opposed to the *vinaya* itself by praising the garments worn by monks from India as preserving the Buddha's way. It is rather the Chinese *vinaya* master, Daoxuan, who has disrupted the smooth transmission of the

physical characteristics of the *kesa* by making things up, and it is his followers who persist in applying these new rules. In this passage, Dōgen shows an inclination to abolish what he views as heterodox elements introduced by Chinese in order to return to a more authentic form, represented in this passage by India. Bodhidharma thus becomes the link back to the original form of Indian robes undisturbed by Daoxuan. Dōgen, as one of the carriers of this Bodhidharma lineage, can then claim to be reinstating the true *kesa* of the authentic transmission.

Tōryū's criticisms are even stronger than Dōgen. He argues that Daoxuan slandered the *dharma* by relying on the guidance of divine beings, and adds that by slandering the elephant trunk *dharma* robe transmitted by the Buddha and ancestors, Daoxuan has committed a grave sin (ZSSZ 2.614b). How can Tōryū be so confident about the physical characteristics of the elephant trunk robe when the term never appears in Dōgen's works?

The answer lies not in texts but in *kesa* artifacts that Tōryū believes represent the true transmission robe. Among these, perhaps the most significant is a nine panel robe that he believes Furong Daojie 芙蓉道楷 (1043-1118) gave to Dōgen's teacher, Rujing, who in turn transmitted it to Dōgen. Tōryū writes that this *kesa,* which is kept in a hidden room at Eiheiji, is a nine panel full elephant trunk robe made of black cloth with a fastening ring made of black wood. He explains that there are twelve temples in Japan that claim to have Furong's robe, but they are all made differently from the great robe kept in the secret room at Eiheiji. Tōryū also claims that he has seen a nine panel elephant trunk robe at Tōfukuji 東福寺 that was believed to have belonged to the Chinese patriarch, Wuzhun Shifan 無準師範 (1178-1249), teacher of Enni Ben'en 円爾辨圓 (1202-1280), founder of Tōfukuji; and one at Kenninji 建仁寺 that belonged to its founder, Eisai 榮西 (1141-1215). Tōryū claims that the robes at these temples are all the

same type of nine-panel robe which is meant to hang down in the back and the front. He also says that when Ōbaku monks came to Japan they brought robes made according to the *vinaya* school directions, but they gradually converted to [wearing] robes of nine panel elephant trunk robe construction (ZSSZ 2.616b).

In contemporary Japan, there are a number of extant nine-panel elephant trunk robes preserved in Sōtō Zen temples, some of them dating back to the early fourteenth century (fig. 3). Nine-panel elephant trunk robes are said to have belonged to important founding clerics in Sōtō. For example, elephant trunk robes attributed to Keizan Jōkin 瑩山紹瑾 (1268-1325) and Gasan Jōseki 峨山紹碩 (1276-1366) are preserved at Sōjiji Soin 總持寺祖院 in Ishikawa prefecture. Nine-panel elephant trunk robes are also held at Yōkōji 永光寺 and Daijōji.[18] These robes have the bowed shape along the top of the long edge of the *kesa* that is characteristic of the elephant trunk style discussed by Menzan below. Sekiguchi Dōjun, who visited Daijōji in 1984 to study the old *kesa* stored there, provides a clear diagram of an elephant robe *kesa* (Sekiguchi 1991, 104 (diagram); and 72-73 (description). Sekiguchi gives measurements of the field portion of the panels which shows that the widths are irregular, ranging from 28 to 35 cm wide. Note the acute angle at the top corners of the robe in the diagram. Sekiguchi also shows the placement of the ring and its placket as well as the specific dimensions of the placket. He describes the variation among these types of robes: some of which are secured with rings and ties, some with ties only, some are plain silk and some are gold brocade, and the colors range from black to yellow. Most of these robes are considered to be transmission robes. Certainly in Tōryū's time, they would have been revered as *kesa* passed down from master to disciple.

It should not be surprising that after seeing these *kesa* treasures, Tōryū concluded that the early Sōtō Zen masters transmitted elephant trunk robes to their disciples since

the physical evidence is strongly in favor of this type of robe. Tōryū is thus arguing that the *kesa* artifact of dharma transmission, regardless of the origin of its physical shape, trumps textual descriptions of the proper *kesa*, even descriptions in Zen texts. If the master passed it on to his disciple, then this fact becomes more important than adhering to texts. The physical form and traditional pedigrees of these *kesa* give Tōryū his confidence about the characteristics of the true transmission robe. The key artifact in this group is the *kesa* purported to be the transmission robe of Furong, which confirms Dōgen's transmission from Rujing. Dōgen does not, however, say that he received Furong's robe from Rujing. Rather, he discusses this robe as evidence of Rujing's serious style. In the fascicle, "Upholding Practice" (*Gyōji* 行持), Dōgen tells the story of Furong refusing the Emperor's gift of a purple robe (DZZ 1.154). In "Transmission Document" (*Shisho* 嗣書), Dōgen mentions Furong's plain robe in order to praise Rujing's restraint in never wearing a multi-colored (*madara* 斑) *kesa* (DZZ 1.342).[19] In these passages, Dōgen gives a bare description of the robe and he does not claim that Rujing gave it to him.

In spite of this lack of written evidence, Tōryū believes that if Dōgen received transmission of the *dharma* from Rujing, then he must also have received a transmission robe. Tōryū's belief in the inseparability of the transmission of the dharma and the robe leads him to the conclusion that the robe that Dōgen received is indeed Furong's robe. Furong's *kesa* must therefore be in Japan, and having been shown the black elephant trunk *kesa* in the hidden room at Eiheiji he decides that this one is the true robe of transmission from Furong via Rujing.[20] Step by step the logic of belief leads Tōryū to the conclusion that Dōgen's conception of the physical characteristics of the true robe of transmission would be based on this particular robe, an elephant trunk robe.

Menzan, however, disputes this evidence and puts Tōryū's methods into question

in his 1763 work, *Questions about Ordination* (*Tokudo waku mon* 得度或問; SSZ *Shingi* 2.199-204). First, Menzan addresses the question of whether the robe transmitted from the Buddha to Mahākāśyapa was an elephant trunk robe, and whether Dōgen wore a robe of this type. The term "elephant trunk," Menzan explains, appears in fascicle nineteen of the *Four Part Vinaya*, where the Buddha criticizes a group of six monks for various infractions of the robe, including wearing them high or low, wearing them so that one corner hangs in front like an "elephant trunk" or with two corners hanging down in front, like a leaf of the tāla tree, or making small pleats (T 22.698b).[21] Other than passages that criticize the elephant trunk, Menzan explains, the term does not appear in Buddhist literature, nor does Dōgen mention it in any of his house rules (*kakun* 家訓) (SSZ 2.200a-b). He then suggests that the term "elephant trunk" is an analogy: just as an elephant observes etiquette by curling up his trunk when eating, new monks must gather up their robes so that a corner does not hang down (SSZ 2.200b-201a).

Unlike Tōryū's condemnation of *vinaya* scholars, Menzan distinguishes between *vinaya* texts and Daoxuan's interpretations, citing directly from the *Four Part Vinaya* in the above discussion. In response to the question of whether Dōgen criticized Daoxuan's approach as a new way of making *kesa*, Menzan writes that various *vinaya* texts explain that there are rag robes, cut and sewn robes, strip seam robes and so on, each of them having their own origin and purpose. Furthermore, he argues, the Buddha encouraged his monks to sew their own robes. Since all these types of robes are described in the Buddha's teaching they are by definition *nyohō e*, and therefore robe sewing is not a private matter between Daoxuan and the gods. Menzan adds that Dōgen's main criticism is in regard to Daoxuan's idea that silk robes cannot be *nyohō e* (SSZ 2.201a-b).

Menzan also objects to Tōryū's argument that the nine panel elephant trunk robe is the true transmission robe. Beginning with Dōgen's sentence, "Now the once-received

robe, the nine type robe, must be properly transmitted from the *Buddhadharma*," Menzan explains that even though the sentence raises the two terms, "once-received robe" and "nine type robe" together, it does not mean that Dōgen is equating them. Rather, this sentence refers to the Buddha's teachings of the four reliances (wearing rag robes, eating once a day, sleeping under a tree and using fermented urine for medicine) that provide guidelines for clothing, food and shelter for his disciples. He explains that as one of these four reliances, the rag robe was the first form of the robe, and is therefore distinguished from all types of robes made from donated fabric, that is, the nine types (of great robe). Thus, Menzan interprets "once received robe" as the singular rag robe which is not divided into types (SSZ 2.200a). Here, Menzan uses *vinaya* explanations of the *kesa* to unpack Dōgen's terse and elliptical sentence. Menzan's interpretation fits better with the dominant theme in "Merit of the *Kesa*" that the rag robe is the highest, most pure form of the Buddhist robe, a perspective that Tōryū appears to ignore in his essay.

Menzan further analyzes how the term elephant trunk robe is used in Japan as a particular type of robe construction introduced by Zen monks returning from China during the Kamakura period. He first claims that Zen monks in China preserved the *kesa* dimensions based on the length of an individual's arm as prescribed by the *vinaya*. Menzan points out that although some of Daoxuan's teachings went beyond the *vinaya*, Zen monks did not accept these deviations. He then cites the four sources of descending authority (*shidai kōsetsu* 四大廣説): the word of the Buddha, the word of the teacher, the teachings of the assembly, and the teachings of a single monk.[22] If one hears a teaching that is not appropriate to the *dharma*, then one must reject it, as Yijing rejected Daoxuan's prohibition of silk, based on his reading of the *vinaya* and his observations of monks that he saw in his travels to India (SSZ 2.202b-203a). The real problem is in showing disrespect for the teachings of the Buddha. There are those during the time of *mappō*, he

explains, who deprecate the *vinaya*, changing the robes according to their own preference. Wearing secular clothing underneath the *kesa* causes the fabric to bunch up and the smooth appearance of the robes is spoiled, so they secretly scoop out the part of the *kesa* that wraps around the body underneath the sleeve, thus breaking the rules about the dimensions of the *kesa*:

> In recent times, robe makers have come to call this technique the "elephant trunk." Ignorant Zen monks hear this term and spread it around so that now there is such a thing called the "elephant trunk *kesa*." Thinking that it is something that comes from the Buddha's time, they say things like, 'there are full elephant trunks and half elephant trunks.' To secretly scoop out even a small amount of the *kesa* described by the Buddha changes the length and width of the panels and it is a violation. It is sad when such self-centered ideas appear in the writings of Zen monks, such a waste.
>
> 近世ノ衣屋ガ、コレヲ象鼻ト稱ス、ソレヲ文妄ナ禪僧ガ聞テ展轉シテ、今此ハ實ニ、象鼻袈裟ト稱リ、佛世ヨリアルコトト思テ、全象鼻、半象鼻ナド云様ニナレリ、佛説ノ法袍ヲ、少シモ和ニエグテハ、壇隔ノ長短ガ違郤ス、非法ハ云フニヲヨバズ、禪僧ノ經論ニウトキ私案、カナシムベシ、穴賢。(SSZ 2.203a-b)[23]

This passage, apparently a direct criticism of Tōryū's essay, puts the issue of elephant trunk robes versus *vinaya* robes in a new light. It is not that the elephant trunk robe is the Zen answer to Daoxuan's deviations. Rather, Menzan argues, this form of robe, produced from vanity, shows a lack of respect for the teachings of the Buddha. The scooped out portion alters the rectangular form of the *kesa* and produces a variation in the dimensions of each of the panels. These alterations, he implies, involved the participation of the robe makers who copied robes imported from China for their clients. In his 1768 *Dharma*

Robes, Menzan describes the social origins of this garment more fully. He suggests that the practice of gouging out the top edge of the *kesa* into a bow shape was prevalent among Song period clerics who attended court functions wearing purple and gold brocade robes given to them by the ruler. He explains that because these outfits included secular clothing worn over the priestly upper garment called the *henzan,* the voluminous *kesa* would bunch up under the right arm when the *kesa* was worn over the left shoulder. The practice of altering the top edge of the *kesa* eased the thickness. Japanese clerics who visited Song China imitated this style and it has continued to this day in Kyoto and Kamakura, he explains, especially among the *gozan* 五山 temples. The colloquial term, elephant trunk robe, which does refer to the way the corner of the large *kesa* droops down, developed among robe makers to distinguish it from robes made according to the instructions of monks knowledgeable in the *vinaya*. Menzan believes that the name elephant trunk robe was in fact a pejorative nickname and should not be considered *nyohō e* (ZSSZ 2.568b-569a).[24] Thus, according to Menzan, the elephant trunk robe derives from an expedient created by robe makers, not from the word of the Buddha, as Tōryū claims.

Tōryū responded to Menzan by vigorously defending his position on the elephant trunk robe in his 1764 *Critique of 'Questions about Ordination'* (*Tokudo waku mon bengi shō* 得度或問辨儀章; ZSSZ 1.149-200), written in 1764, one year after Menzan's essay. Tōryū gave detailed instructions on how to wear the elephant trunk robe and continued the argument in *Clear Mirror of Daijōji's Defense of the Dharma* (*Daijoji goho myokan* 大乘寺護法明鑑), published posthumously in 1766 (Kawaguchi 1976, 371).[25] As we have seen, the text of Tōryū's *Elephant Trunk Robe* was given new life in Daisen's commentary, published in 1808.

Tōryū also influenced the use of the gold brocade robe (*kinran-e* 金襴衣) in Sōtō.

First introduced during the Kamakura period, these gold brocade textiles were relatively scarce until the Tokugawa period. In the Tokugawa period weaving techniques improved and the Nishijin weaving industry began to produce a better grade of gold brocade. No longer dependent on Chinese imports, Japanese craftsmen began to produce *kesa* made out of gold brocade fabrics (Kawaguchi 197, 372). In *Elephant Trunk Robe,* Tōryū explains that the term *kinran* (gold brocade) is a common name (*tsūshō* 通称) for *kesa* in which any color can be used, and *funzōe* (rag robe) is a common name for *kesa* in which any fabric is good, whether it is gold brocade, silk or cotton. He commented that this Zen teaching transcends the biased grasping of the inferior *vinaya* (ZSSZ 2.607a). Daisen, Tōryū's nineteenth century editor, affirms this position, adding that since the robe that Śākyamuni gave to Mahākāśyapa was gold brocade it would be acceptable for the Zen school. Daisen then suggests that the Sōtō Zen school balances the two extremes as seen in the robes of its two most influential teachers: Dōgen and Keizan. Although Dōgen wore a black robe all his life, Keizan received a colored robe by the ruler's command and he wore it. Dōgen, subdued on the outside, was highly decorated on the inside, whereas Keizan was decorated on the outside. The most important thing, Daisen concludes, is to ask whether the person has a way seeking mind or not. According to the mind of the way either gold brocade or ragged clothes are appropriate (ZSSZ 2.607b).

Tōryū and Daisen's arguments propose a justification for Sōtō Zen clerics to don decorative gold brocade *kesa* but they garble the two categories of the gold brocade robe and the rag robe. Tōryū argues that *kinran* and *funzōe* refer to *kesa* without consideration of color or fabric. Note that instead of using the term *nōe,* which according to the *vinaya* can refer to robes of all colors and types of fabric, Tōryū uses the term *funzōe.* In Tōryū's argument we can see a more explicit dissolving of the boundaries between the rag robe and the golden robe of the Buddha that I suggested in chapter two. It is partly a question

of the materials being similar, that is, both rags and brocade may have "all colors;" and partly a religious matter based on Dōgen's observations in "Merit of the *Kesa*" that the *kesa* is neither silk nor cotton and that any fabric can be considered rags. Dōgen's remarks open up the possibility of an "anything goes" approach, but without rags and gold brocade, there is no material reason to make the argument.

Menzan, however, firmly rejects this permissive interpretation. He argues from scriptural passages that the gold brocade robe given to Mahākāśyapa by Śākyamuni was given in trust for Maitreya Buddha and is not to be worn. Mahākāśyapa, he comments, was renowned for wearing rag robes and was never referred to in scripture as wearing a gold brocade robe. Furthermore, Menzan argues, all fabrics with a design of colors (*madara* 斑) or glittering fabric (*ran* 爛) are also to be rejected (*ZSSZ* 2.558).

Menzan critiques Tōryū's position on the gold brocade robe based on his knowledge of Buddhist scripture and of Dōgen, but Menzan is the only voice in Sōtō that opposes the adoption of gold brocade robes (Kawaguchi 1976, 382). Tōryū's influence as abbot of Daijōji meant that his interpretation was preserved and later promoted by Daisen in the beginning of the nineteenth century. Tōryū interpreted the ideal of the *kesa* in Dōgen's writing by looking at extant *kesa* that he believed were contemporary with Dōgen's time. His arguments in *Elephant Trunk Robe* provided some of the fuel for mid-nineteenth century struggles between Eiheiji and Daijōji in the "three robe controversy."

The next section gives an historical overview of the three robe controversy that erupted in the mid-nineteenth century. This controversy affected relations between major temples in Sōtō Zen, and even affected intramural alliances based on how a priest wore his *kesa*. The disaffection between different factions was still strong when Sawaki Kōdō

went to Eiheiji and was a factor in his decision to study the *kesa*. After a brief history of this conflict I will discuss Sawaki and Hashimoto's popularization of the practice of sewing *kesa* and their conception of the *nyohō kesa* in the twentieth century.

Part Three. The Three Robe Controversy and its impact on the Sōtō approach to *kesa*

Tōryū belonged to the lineage of Gesshū and Manzan, the Sōtō Zen reformers who promoted a return to the old ways of Sōtō conceived of as rules based on the teachings of both Dōgen and Keizan. Tōryū accepted the traditional attributions of transmission *kesa* and used their physical characteristics to explain Dōgen's texts. The monastic practices that he oversaw at Daijōji were based on a reformed rule that combined the teachings of Dōgen and Keizan, but also incorporated elements of the *Ōbaku pure rules* (*Ōbaku shingi* 黄檗清規).[26]

The monastic rule that Gesshū and Manzan established at Daijōji was criticized by Sonnō Sōeki 損翁宗益 (1557-1620), Menzan's teacher, for retaining this Ōbaku influence. Although Menzan continued his teacher's stand against Ōbaku, he was unable to effect institutional change because he never became abbot at the major Sōtō temples. When Gentō Sokuchū 玄透即中 (1729-1807) became abbot of Eiheiji in 1795, however, he actively sought to excise the Ōbaku influence from the "return to the old ways" movement.[27]

Gentō's first act was to send his compilation, *Annotated Pure Rules of Eihei* [*Dōgen*] (*Kanchū Eihei shōshingi* 冠註永平小清規) to Daijōji with a letter to the abbot, Mugaku Gūzen 無學愚禪 (1733-1829), urging him to implement these rules (Kagamishima 1985, 156-157). This would mean discarding the Daijōji reforms set in place by Gesshū and Manzan. Mugaku resisted in part because he felt that Gentō's

agenda was to control Daijōji. The conflict between the Eiheiji and Daijōji abbots escalated to the point where Mugaku finally retired in 1798. Three years later, Eiheiji cancelled the winter training session at Daijōji using the excuse that there was no abbot in place. This institutional challenge spurred Daijōji to bring the dispute to the "three liaison temples," *kansan sentsu* 關三刹, appointed by the government to resolve disputes, and to the government office of shrines and temples, *jisha bugyō* 寺社奉行.[28] Daijōji, unable to work out a compromise with Gentō, sought a political solution.

In regard to the *kesa*, Gentō argued against the use of the ring (*kan* 環) used to fasten the *kesa* at the shoulder. Gentō saw this practice as contrary to the "old rules," and sought to eliminate it from all Sōtō garments, regardless of temple customs (Kawaguchi 1984, 148).[29] The practice of using a ring carved from valuable materials in intricate designs had begun in China, and it was often used in gold brocade transmission robes imported to Japan during the Kamakura period. Myōan Eisai 明庵榮西 (1114-1215), who founded the Zen temple, Kenninji 建仁寺 in Kyoto, is traditionally credited with introducing these new Song style robes to Japan on his return from China in 1191. The long sleeves on his Song style robe (*jikitotsu*) was shocking enough, but Eisai also brought the elongated style of *kesa* discussed in the previous section. At that time, Japanese Buddhists wore five or seven panel robes, so the larger number of panels in addition to the unusually wide dimensions of the *kesa* surprised people. Over a hundred years later, in 1322, the Gozan monk, Kōkan Shiren 虎關師錬 (1278-1346) wrote about these garments in his *Record of Buddhism through the Genkō era* (*Genkō shakusho* 元亨釋書):

> In the third month of 1204 there was a typhoon in central Kyoto. The townspeople said, "Recently, Eisai has been proclaiming a new teaching of the essentials of Zen. His disciples' robes are of an unusual construction with

increased dimensions and the *jikitotsu* has great sleeves. When he walks along the street, great winds swirl within the bellowing [garments]." Now, accordingly, this is the basis of the fear that Eisai will cause a fire.

元久二年春三月幾甸大風。都人謠言。比來西師新唱禪要。其徒衣服異製。加製博幅直綴大袖。行道時多含飆風。今巽二作災恐基於西乎。(Mohr 2001, 26b; DNB 101.26b)

The large Zen *kesa* were fastened with a ring and a cord, both of which could be highly decorated or plain. A portrait statue of Eisai at Jufukiji 寿福寺 in Kamakura shows him wearing the long sleeved *jikitotsu* with a plain but large ring fastening the *kesa* over the left chest (fig. 1, from Izutsu 1965, plate 89).[30] Among scholar monks in Japan the introduction of the ring was attributed to Daoxuan, not to Song innovations.[31]

Kawaguchi (1976, 323-324) challenges the idea that Daoxuan initiated the use of beautiful brocades and decorated rings in *kesa*, arguing that to the contrary, Daoxuan criticized practices in his day that he deemed too decorative. Through the eyes of Japanese scholar monks familiar with Song modifications of the robe, it is true that Daoxuan appears to affirm these later practices. He defends a style of wearing the robe that he refers to as the elephant trunk but his use of the term is closely linked to the placement of the ties as prescribed in the *Four Part Vinaya* and the resulting drapery of the rectangular *kesa* when worn on the left shoulder.[32] Daoxuan's comments, however, should not be interpreted as approval of the scooped out shape or the elongated dimensions described by Menzan in the preceding section. In his *Vinaya Revelations,* Daoxuan also criticizes some ways of wearing the robe as effeminate, even lewd, like a loose woman or an elephant (T45. 881a). Furthermore, Daoxuan cited the prohibition against making pleats (to gather the folds of excess cloth) and he criticized the use of precious metals in fastenings and other embellishments to the *kesa*. Kawaguchi

concludes that the manner of wearing the *kesa* and the highly decorated forms of the Song period *kesa* that were imported to Japan were in fact a Song period misinterpretation of Daoxuan's teachings. Thus, Japanese scholar-monks have both credited Daoxuan as the ultimate authority regarding the *kesa* according to the *vinaya* as well as blamed him for setting in motion Song deviations from the proper form of the robe.

Embedded in this debate about whether a corner of the *kesa* dangles down in front is the technical question of the placement of the ties which determines how the cloth drapes. If one follows Daoxuan's explanation, as most *vinaya* scholars in the Edo period did, then the front tie (or ring) is placed at the edge of the right border of the *kesa*. A cloth tie which is anchored just to the left of the midline, about six inches (eight fingers) from the top edge of the *kesa* border, will then meet the ring just below the left shoulder when worn on the body (fig. 2, from Izutsu 1965, 124). *Vinaya* scholar-monks considered this method of placing the ties as an essential feature of Daoxuan's thought, and applied it rigorously. As Kawaguchi points out, however, Daoxuan's view on this point was inconsistent, and perhaps he was still trying to understand the *vinaya* instructions himself.

On the other hand, Japanese scholar monks who consulted Yijing's 703 translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya* could compare its directions with Daoxuan. This *vinaya* instructs one to place the ties by first folding the horizontal length of the *kesa* in thirds and then sewing the front and back ties onto the *kesa* at these vertical folds. The ties are therefore placed at equal thirds on the width of the *kesa* and when it wraps around the body and is tied over the chest, the surplus fabric may be neatly tucked away rather than hanging down. In a rectangular *kesa* that is made according to the *vinaya* prescribed dimensions of three by five arm lengths, this position of the ties eliminates the problem of

the drooping "elephant trunk" that Daoxuan mentions. Traditional Japanese *vinaya* reformers, who viewed Daoxuan's teachings as the ultimate authority, would not adopt the rule of thirds described in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya*. As an indication of how seriously this matter was taken, Jiun is said to have been expunged from the Yachūji record of *vinaya* monks for adopting the Mūlasarvāstivāda style of tie placement (Kawaguchi 1976, 324 and 332, fn. 17).[33]

The issue of where the ties are placed is closely linked to the contradictory statements about the "elephant trunk" in Daoxuan's writing. If Song styles were created out of a misunderstanding of Daoxuan's work, as Kawaguchi suggests, then the very long *kesa* transmitted in the Zen lineage, later referred to as the "elephant trunk *kesa*," might have been an attempt to create the drapery that Daoxuan discusses. The style of these elaborate gold brocade robes with their large rings, however, was clearly intended to awe the beholder, and can be understood as a testament to the political status of the Zen lineage in the Song period. Their importation and adoption especially in the *gōzan* temples during the Kamakura period would have been just one expression of the high status that the Zen school carried into Japan.

Gentō's insistence that the ring was not suitable for Sōtō Zen *kesa*, therefore, was connected to much wider, complex, and little understood aspect of *kesa* practice in China and Japan. As discussed in the first half of this chapter, extant transmission robes from the Kamakura period that were valued as temple treasures in both Rinzai and Sōtō schools show Song period modifications that transgress *vinaya* rules about form, material and color. As deviations from the form prescribed by the Buddha himself, wouldn't these garments undermine the validity of the direct line of transmission between master and disciple back to the time of the Buddha? On the other hand, given the mythology about these robes as tangible signs of *dharma* transmission, it is inconceivable that they would

be disparaged or devalued because they did not adhere to *vinaya* rules.

In the late Tokugawa period the Sōtō, Rinzai, and Ōbaku schools shared similar practices and *kesa* forms. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the government requested that Buddhist schools identify the distinct characteristics of their vestments, so this meant that Sōtō would have to distinguish its own robes from Rinzai and Ōbaku. During Gentō's tenure at Eiheiji the government issued directives in the eleventh month of 1801 and in the second month of 1802 that required all Buddhist schools to standardize and publish regulations concerning the colors of their *kesa* and their corresponding ranks (Kawaguchi 1984, 145).[34] One month later the Sōtō school sent their response to the government, *Form of Sōtō Robes* (*Sōtō shū etai no koto* 曹洞宗衣体の事). The provisions of the document discuss the kinds of allowable fabric and colors for clerics of various ranks and limit the use of purple robes to the abbots of Sōjiji and Eiheiji.[35]

The 1801 *Form of Sōtō Robes* also stipulates that in everyday wear, priests may wear a *kakeraku* 掛落, or, as it is more commonly known today, a *rakusu* 絡子 (fig. 5-4).[36] This garment is a pieced rectangle approximately eight by ten inches, bordered by a frame and suspended from the neck so that it hangs in front of the chest. The origin of the garment is unclear. The Tang emperor, Zetian Wuhou 則天武后 (624-705; r. 690-705) is supposed to have suggested that Zen monks might wear an abbreviated *kesa* when they work in the fields, but there appears to be no textual evidence for this ("rakusu" in ZGD 1259a). The earliest reference to the garment is in fascicle eleven of *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* (compiled 1004) which records that a small pieced rectangle hung from the neck was worn by a wanderer who had received the tonsure but had not received either precepts or *kesa* (T 51.287a). Daocheng's 道誠 (fl. 1019) *Manual for Buddhist Monks* (*Shishi yaolan* 釋氏要覽, T 54. no. 2127), written in 1019, describes the origin of the *rakusu* as a casual garment made by older Zen monks and copied by their

students in the Southern Mountain school of Chan (fasc. 1, T 54.270c). Although some sources refer to the garment as an abbreviated five panel *kesa*, Daocheng's remarks indicate that it is a Chinese innovation, only very loosely connected to the *kesa*. In addition, none of the names used to refer to this garment are found in the *vinaya* ("gojōe" in BD 1256-58). The use of the *rakusu* in Japan begins in the Kamakura period when it was introduced from Song China by Zen monks. The *rakusu* later became a point of contention between Eiheiji and Daijōji in the "three robe controversy" but it is apparent that in 1801, when Gentō was abbot of Eiheiji, the *rakusu* was accepted as a legitimate clerical vestment.

Dōgen's lack of specificity about the physical aspects of the *kesa* as well as his apparent acceptance of Song period robes should have made it difficult to argue against the use of the ring as a fastener for the *kesa*. Dōgen is said to have worn black robes all his life, and that he wore the "old style" Chinese garments beneath the *kesa* for ceremonial occasions: the separate top, *henzan*, and skirt, *kunze*, in lieu of the Song period one-piece *jikitotsu* (Kawaguchi 1984, 142).[37] It is unclear, though, what Dōgen's *kesa* was like. If Gentō and subsequent reformers determined that the ring was an unwelcome deviation from Dōgen's style, they would have to argue that Dōgen did not wear a *kesa* that was fastened with a ring. Dōgen did not, however, describe an "old style" for *kesa*, nor did he explicitly prohibit a metal fastening in a ring shape as unsuitable.

In the previous chapter I introduced *Proper Dharma Garments*, completed by Mokushitsu Ryōyō in 1821. This work can be considered the culmination of Sōtō scholarship about the *kesa* during the Tokugawa period for two reasons. First, it attempts to resolve issues raised by earlier Sōtō scholar-monks by using Dōgen's writings as the primary authority supplemented by *vinaya* and scriptural sources. Second, *Proper*

Dharma Garments was written just as Tokugawa period *kesa* research was beginning to wane, and so in a sense it was the last word before the changes of the Meiji restoration and modernization began.

On the issue of the ring, Mokushitsu's *Proper Dharma Garments* and Sōkō's *Field of Merit* provide crucial links between Gentō's strong leadership in the early 1800s and the full-blown dispute about robes that erupted between Eiheiji and Sōjiji during 1850-1861. Nishiari explains in the preface to his 1896 publication of *Proper Dharma Garments* (*Tōjō Hōbuku kakushō* 洞上法服格正) that Zuikō Chingyū 瑞岡珍牛 (1743-1822) of Banshōji 萬松寺 in Nagoya, who had published Dōgen's writings, gave full support to Gentō Sokuchū's advocacy of a return to the pure rules of Eiheiji, as well as a restoration of robes. *Argument for a Restoration of the Ragged (robe)* (*Kaku hei ron* 革弊論), traditionally attributed to Chingyū, was written to support this point.[38] The afterward to the 1896 publication explains that the research was inspired in part by Teishū Genmō 提宗玄網 of Zenkūin 全久院, a temple of the Toda family 戸田家. He had been quizzed by his lay sponsor about the significance of the *kesa*. Replying that the question was too important to be answered lightly, Genmō is said to have feigned illness and the need of a rest at a hot spring resort, but instead went to Gokokuin 護國院 in Nagoya to consult with Chingyū's disciple, Mokushitsu. With Dōgen's works as the central theme, Mokushitsu and his colleagues made full use of Tokugawa works on the *kesa*, including Jiun's writings, and consulting with Gōchō Kankai (introduced in chapter four), a Tendai monk in the Anraku Vinaya lineage who was close to Chingyū and was often in residence at Banshōji.

The seventh chapter explains the incident that was the basis for the rule for using fastenings on *kesa* in the *vinaya*. One day Śariputra went to visit a lay person's house when a gust of wind blew his robes open. After this incident, the Buddha is said to have

permitted the use of fastenings on the robe, and even a belt for the lower robes (fasc. 26, *Five Part Vinaya* T 22.174c). Although metal was allowed, gold, silver and precious materials were prohibited by several *vinaya*.[39] The compound term, *kōchū* 鈎紐, refers to the dual fastenings of hook or partial ring *kō* 鈎, and tie *chū* 紐. When worn on the body the metal piece attached to the front right side of the robe meets the tie attached to the left of the central back panel of the *kesa*. An alternative method is to make a hook and loop system using cloth ties throughout, also referred to as *kōchū*, but the character for *kō* has the cloth radical instead of the metal radical as above. According to *Proper Dharma Garments*, the key point is that when a metal fastener is used, it must be a device that is not a full circle. The enclosed ring, *kan* 環, or *enkan* 円環, is prohibited. On this point, *Proper Dharma Garments* quotes *vinaya* master Tainin 諦忍 (1705-1786):

> In the teachings of Śākyamuni's lifetime there was no such thing as a ring, which comes from the speculations of foolish, ignorant people and it is a violation of the *dharma* and the *vinaya*. *Vinaya* texts only establish a rule for the curved metal piece and the tie.
>
> 釋迦一代ノ教法ニ、袈裟ノ環ト云コト絶えて無コトナリ。コレミナ無智愚輩ノ臆度ヨリ出タルコトニシテ、非法非律ノ相ナリ。律文ハ唯鈎ト紐トノ制バカリナリ。(Kawaguchi 1976, 195).

Proper Dharma Garments provides the six citations from the *vinaya* and other sources that Tainin uses to support his point. This chapter makes it clear that precious materials are not allowed, and it resolves the question of whether metal fixtures in themselves are allowed, but it introduces a different problem. How does one distinguish the incomplete circle versus the complete circle when the tie is likely to obscure the slight break in an otherwise circular metal fastening? In portraiture the problem of verifying whether the fastener is a closed or open ring becomes nearly impossible. If a portrait of Dōgen

depicts him wearing a ring on the *kesa*, how does one determine whether it conforms with the *vinaya*? The analytic *Proper Dharma Garments* discusses the intricacies of the *vinaya* ruling about fastenings, but it does not answer the question. In fact, the discussion in *Proper Dharma Garments* is a subtle defense of the use of a ring-like metal fixture that would not support a strong ideology against the use of rings.

Sōkō's *Field of Merit*, written and published in 1825, provides clear support for elimination of metal fastenings in favor of the cloth tie system. Although written in Chinese, the text is illustrated and shows the cloth ties clearly. Sōkō's chapter on *kesa* fastenings describes and illustrates a cloth loop or button (Kawaguchi 1984, 72-78). Jiun used this method which was based on Yijing's translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya*. *Field of Merit* makes it appear that cloth ties are closer to the *Buddhadharma* simply by ignoring the alternative of metal fixtures. Unlike *Proper Dharma Garments,* which was kept in private hands, *Field of Merit* was published and therefore available for those who wished to argue against the ring.

The "three robe controversy," which erupted between Eiheiji and Sōjiji in 1850, was ostensibly about the use of the ring in *kesa* of seven and nine or more panels and about the use of the *rakusu* in lieu of the five panel *kesa.* Proponents at Eiheiji, whose style of *kesa* used a tie or cord system of fastenings, insisted that the ring should be abolished in Sōjiji as well, a move that was taken as an assertion of dominance. Clerics at Sōjiji understood this move as a continuation of Gentō's project to establish the Eiheiji pure rules for all of Sōtō (Kawaguchi 2002, 266-267). As with the incident with Daijōji at the turn of the century, Eiheiji and Sōjiji were unable to resolve their dispute and they turned to the government for a resolution.

In 1858 Sōjiji petitioned the government for a resolution to the dispute, arguing that the founder, Keizan, and his disciple, Gasan Jōseki 峨山韶碩 (1276-1366), had

established the ring style of fastening for the nine and seven panel *kesa* and the *rakusu*, a practice that had been preserved ever since at Sōjiji. Eiheiji responded that because the use of the ring was established by Daoxuan, it would therefore be in conflict with Dōgen's teachings. In addition, Eiheiji clerics asserted that the *rakusu* was not a legitimately abbreviated form of the five panel *kesa*. Replacing the five panel *kesa* with a *rakusu* would therefore violate Dōgen's teaching about preserving the three robes. On this first occasion the government ruled that the dispute should be solved by the two sides doing as suited them. This decision meant that there would be two different styles at the two main temples.

In 1860 the two temples again petitioned the government. While Sōjiji and its affiliate temples in Kaga, Noto and Etchū provinces had received permission to use the ring according to the customs of their temples, Eiheiji wanted to clarify that while visiting Eiheiji all priests must use *kesa* without rings. Moreover, they argued, robes worn for promotion ceremonies (*ten'e* 轉衣), or when going to the capital on official business should be without a ring. In 1861 Sōjiji again petitioned the government, at last receiving permission to use *kesa* with a ring as appropriate. Over these twelve years there was a conflict between long held customs and a revival of the "old rules" as defined by Eiheiji. The issue of whether the ring was appropriate for Sōtō Zen *kesa* was so keenly felt that some portraits of Dōgen that depicted a ring in the *kesa* were altered to remove the image of the ring (Kawaguchi 1984, 150).[40]

Tensions continued over this issue, but in 1872, in the midst of early Meiji period anti-Buddhist movements, Eiheiji and Sōjiji made a pact to cooperate. Seven years later the two temples published a report stating their mutual agreement and sent it to the government and to their own subtemples. The eighth provision of this document concerns appropriate dress. It states that the form of the robe in Sōtō follows the pure rules of both

Eiheiji and Keizan. This provision institutionalized the principle that the two main temples followed different styles of dress and subtemples should not use this as a basis for criticism or factionalism. In 1884 the government issued orders that with the separation of Shintō and Buddhism, each of the schools had to resubmit policy statements concerning the principles, ranks, and organization of their school.

In 1886 Azegami Baisen 畔上楳仙 of Sōjiji and Takiya Takushū 滝谷琢宗 of Eiheiji consulted with scholars from every region, and produced a plan for the Sōtō school. There were three main points in this document concerning Sōtō robes. First, in lieu of a five panel *kesa* (which was favored by Eiheiji) clerics would wear the *rakusu*. *Kesa* of seven or more panels would not have a ring (which was favored by Sōjiji), and the size would be based on the individual's dimensions, using the system of arm lengths. Second, transmission robes should be preserved at the temples where they had been passed down as temple treasures and the structure of their rings or ties should not be altered. These robes, however, could no longer be worn. Third, the document set out a deadline of the first month of 1888 for reform of the robes at branch temples throughout the country. After that date, those who did not reform their robe would be cautioned. Exemptions were granted to monks over the age of sixty if they requested it from Sōtō headquarters. Thus both sides compromised: Eiheiji got rid of the ring from *kesa*, and Sōjiji got the *rakusu* in place of the five panel *kesa*, a substantial compromise on both sides for the sake of institutional solidarity. In the first month of 1888, exceptions were granted to only thirty-three people: thirteen of the Sōjiji lineage who requested permission to retain the *kesa* ring, and twenty of the Eiheiji lineage who requested to wear the five panel *kesa* instead of the *rakusu*. In spite of this relatively successful effort at compromise, Kawaguchi reports that in some cases the second provision for the

protection of artifacts was violated, and rings were removed from old *kesa* and portraits (1984, 154-155).

The bitter disputes over the form of the Sōtō robe at the end of the Tokugawa period and the compromise achieved in the first two decades of the Meiji era created a complex and somewhat uneasy background for the *nyohō e* movement in twentieth century Sōtō Zen. The various elements of these disputes cannot be reduced to a power struggle between the two main temples of Sōjiji and Eiheiji. Sōtō clerics convinced themselves that the writings of Dōgen and/or Keizan were sufficient to establish rules concerning *kesa*. To resolve the inevitable inconsistencies and lacunae of these texts, clerics could either turn to the *kesa* artifacts and art to answer their questions, as did Tōryū, or rely on the *vinaya* and Zen sources, as did Menzan. One problem of relying on the founding figures of Dōgen and Keizan was that disagreements over form and practice could threaten the integrity of the whole school. In comparison, *vinaya* enthusiasts in other schools could occupy a specialist niche without challenging the older structures of their school. This might have occurred in Sōtō as well, but the insistence of Gentō and others on establishing an institutional reform that directly challenged long-held customs of dress and practice led the Sōtō school to the brink of schism. The hard-won compromise achieved during the Meiji period meant that the definition of Sōtō Zen robes would now be firmly held by the Sōtō corporation, and decisions about dress would be based on compromise. In the next section I will discuss how the impetus for reform was expressed in the modern movement established by Sawaki Kōdō and Hashimoto Ekō.

Part Four. Foundation and Development of the *nyohō e* Movement in Modern Sōtō Zen

The story of the sewing movement begun by Sawaki and Hashimoto begins with the

complicated fate of Mokushitsu's *Proper Dharma Garments.* By the third decade of the nineteenth century when Mokushitsu finished his manuscript, knowledge of the form and meaning of the *kesa* in Sōtō Zen was limited to the elite levels of scholar monks. Except for Menzan's readable *Dharma Robes*, Sōtō authors wrote in learned Chinese. Given the difficulties of the subject and the lack of explanatory materials, these works appeared to be condemned to obscurity.

Mokushitsu's work, although written in Japanese, was still unpublished at the time of his death in 1833. He had entrusted the manuscript to Gettan Zenryū 月潭全竜 (?-1865) with instructions for corrections to be made in the text. Gettan lectured on the text and continued to edit it, but he did not publish it. At the time of his death, a number of hand copies of the text were in circulation, including one owned by the Daimyō of Toda, whose predecessor had helped to initiate Mokushitsu's research. During the early Meiji period, this copy of the unpublished manuscript was used in inquisition style mock courts to humiliate and defrock a large percentage of Toda's Buddhist priests from various schools (Kawaguchi 2002, 281). At last, Nishiari, one of Gettan's students, consulted with a *vinaya* teacher and finished the corrections. Azegami of Sōjiji, who had negotiated the pact of cooperation with Eiheiji in the beginning of the Meiji era, helped Nishiari to publish *Proper Dharma Garments* in 1896.[41]

Credit for the implementation and popularization of these teachings during the early twentieth century must be given to Sawaki and Hashimoto Ekō whose lives spanned the years of Japan's modernization and military ambitions, from the anti-Buddhist years of the Meiji period through the post-war reconstruction of Japan as an international economic power. The following discussion gives a brief biographical sketch and discussion of their teachings about the *kesa.* The twenty years from 1922 to 1942 were the most important for developing their views on the *kesa* so I have emphasized this part

of their biography, selecting passages from their writings that date from this era. I focus on how they present sewing *kesa* not only as a meritorious act, but as an expression of Sōtō Zen teachings.

Hashimoto and Sawaki drew much of their inspiration about Dōgen's approach to the *kesa* from their teacher, Oka Sōtan 丘宗潭 (1860-1921), one of Nishiari's foremost disciples, and a scholar of Dōgen's *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma*. In 1899 Oka became the overseer (*kanken* 監兼) of Sōtō University and presided over the first Sōtō school educational conference. Oka was commissioned to be the speaker at the first session of the newly established *Genzō-e* (眼藏會), a study group initiated by the abbot of Eiheiji, Morita Goyū 森田悟由 (1834-1915).[42] Morita, who held several high level administrative positions at both Eiheiji and Sōjiji, worked hard to calm relations between these two head temples by participating in the creation of a standardized ritual manual, *Standard Observances of the Sōtō Tradition* (*Tōjō gyōji kihan* 洞上行持軌範).[43] The first *Genzō-e* took place at Eiheiji in 1905 from May first to July tenth, a seventy day lecture series. Oka again led the *Genzō-e* from 1915 to 1918, for a total of five years. Oka's influence on this event continued through his students and their students. Over a seventy year period, until 1974, they gave lectures for over half the *Genzō-e* events.[44] In 1913 Oka edited three works on the precepts while being the director (*kan'in* 監院) of Eiheiji. In the following year Oka became president of Sōtō University, but during this period he was also resident teacher at several temples in the main island of Japan and in Kyūshu where Hashimoto and Sawaki studied with him.[45]

In 1922, Sawaki and Hashimoto jointly published Sōkō's *Field of Merit*. During the 1930s Sawaki lectured on *Proper Dharma Garments* while Hashimoto published lectures on this work in the periodical, *Dōgen*. They encouraged their followers to put into practice the instructions for sewing *kesa* in these two works. Both teachers saw the

practice of *zazen* as inextricably linked to wearing the *kesa* and taught their lay followers to sew both *rakusu* and *kesa* to wear during *zazen*. Sawaki and Hashimoto viewed the revival of religious practices concerning the *kesa* to be fundamental for Sōtō Zen, and kept the ideal of Gentō's reform alive. Perhaps it is for this reason that their activities have sometimes been viewed with suspicion by Sōtō Zen administrators. Although their relationship became somewhat more distant in later years, contemporary *kesa* sewing leaders emphasize that there are only slight differences in styles that evolved from these two teachers.

Biography of Sawaki Kōdō

Sawaki Kōdō was born in 1880 in Mie prefecture to a family of rickshaw artisans. He lost both parents by the age of eight and was eventually adopted by a less prosperous family who put him to work to support them.[46] His education was often interrupted, but he finally graduated from primary school at the age of thirteen. At seventeen, Sawaki was determined to become a monk, and walked nearly two hundred miles from his home in Isu peninsula to Eiheiji. After a year working as a laborer at Eiheiji, Sawaki travelled to Kyūshū to practice at Sōshinji 宗心寺 in Amakusa 天草 in Kumamoto prefecture where he received clerical ordination from Sawada Kōhō 沢田興法 (fl. 1880). In 1899, after two years at Sōshinji, Sawaki went to practice in Hyōgo prefecture where he attracted the attention of Fueoka Ryōun 笛岡凌雲 (1845-1923).

Fueoka, who had been Nishiari Bokuzan's close disciple for twenty years, left a strong impression on Sawaki who saw this quiet monk as the personification of Dōgen's teaching. Sawaki followed Fueoka to various temples for the next year and a half until he was drafted into the army in December of 1900. Sawaki served in the army for the

required three years and was released, but was drafted once again in 1904 to serve at the front during the Russo-Japanese war. Sawaki finally left the army in 1906 at the age of twenty six and returned to his ordination teacher, Sawada, from whom he received *dharma* transmission in August of the same year. The formative years of Sawaki's youth were divided between Sōtō Zen training and military service.

Having received *dharma* transmission, Sawaki spent the next six years completing his high school education and then studying Buddhist thought at Hōryūji where he attended lectures given by Saeki Jōin 佐伯定胤 (1867-1952), the abbot of Hōryūji and head of the Hossō school. Saeki had revived the study of Buddhism at Hōryūji, creating a small college that attracted clerics from various schools. Saeki, who had trained in Abhidharma and Yogacara thought at Sennyūji in Kyoto, developed a curriculum in Buddhist studies that included all the major teachings. This gave Sawaki a broad basic education in Buddhism. During these six years Sawaki continued to study *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma*, relying on a commentary called the *Monge* 聞解 which at the time was attributed to Menzan. In 1908 he visited Jiun's temple, Kōkiji 高貴寺, on Mt. Katsuragi 葛城山 and saw the robes made by Jiun's followers that had been stored there. Not long after this Sawaki met two Shingon nuns of Jiun's lineage who invited him to lecture on Dōgen's teachings and in return taught him about Jiun's method of making robes.

In 1913, in the first year after leaving Hōryūji, Sawaki was promoted by the Sōtō school and was now eligible to wear colored robes and to be referred to as a venerable teacher (*oshō* 和尚). In this year he met Oka and served as his personal attendant during a retreat at Anyōji 安養寺 in Shizuoka. Sawaki also attended the *Genzō-e* study group that Oka led in 1915. From 1914-1916 Sawaki spent periods of retreat at Jōfukuji 成福寺, an empty temple near Hōryūji where he sat *zazen* from morning to night. In 1916 he

left for Kumamoto in Kyūshū where he became a lecturer at Daijiji 大慈寺 and formed a *zazen* group for high school students in Kyūshū. During the 1920s Sawaki travelled throughout the country to lead meditation groups and came to be called the Itinerant Temple (*idō sōrin* 移動叢林).[47] He often used facilities donated by his followers, including a house in Kumamoto which he kept until 1935. Thus, although not tied to one temple, Sawaki was by no means without a roof over his head. Rather, the lack of a stable temple affiliation allowed Sawaki to gradually build a nationwide network of supporters through the 1920s and 1930s.

In 1931 Sawaki was invited by Hashimoto Chikumon 橋本竹門 of Hōzōji 法藏寺 in Aichi province to give a lecture series on *Proper Dharma Garments* for the hundred year memorial of Mokushitsu. The lectures were held at Mokushitsu's temple, Gokokuin, renamed Taianden 泰安殿 in 1907. The facilities could accommodate an audience of six hundred and each day the hall was full. During the week Sawaki also gave practical lectures on sewing *kesa*. In the fall of the same year Sawaki repeated the lecture series at the Nagoya Study Center for Nuns (*Nagoya nisō gakurin* 名古屋尼僧學林). The nuns began to sew *kesa* according to Sawaki's instructions, using cloth bought through the fund-raising efforts of Sekitō Genpō 関戸元峰, a direct descendent in Chingyū's lineage who had become an enthusiastic and tireless promoter of the "robe according to the dharma" (Tanaka 1999, 2.60-61).

In 1935 Sawaki was given a teaching position at Komazawa University 駒澤大学 (formerly Sōtō University) at the same time that he was appointed to the rank of *godō* 後堂 at Sōjiji 總持寺. He began to publish articles about Zen practice in the journal, *Daihōrin* 大法輪, and in the same year, one of his students at Komazawa University initiated a journal called *Henshō* 返照 to publish Sawaki's talks and to inform his followers about Sawaki's itinerary of retreats and meetings. Since the 1931 lectures

Sawaki had become a public figure, but these publications supported and expanded his popularity. In the third month of 1941, Sawaki, now in his sixties, was appointed to a group of Sōtō Zen leaders (*Sōtō shū sanzen shidōha* 曹洞宗参禅指導派) who were part of the government's "new order" (*shintai sei* 新体制), created to mobilize the population for the war effort. Two months later he was sent to Manchuria on a speaking tour (*junshaku* 巡錫), which was repeated the following year. Sawaki's talents in motivational public speaking were thus recognized and utilized by the Sōtō school and the government during the war effort.[48]

Sawaki's teaching about the *kesa*

The following discussion of Sawaki's teachings about the *kesa* is based on lectures that Sawaki gave and published during the 1930s. In 1936, his first year at Komazawa University, he published "The robe and the *dharma* are one" (*ehō ichinyo* 衣法一如) in the Komazawa University journal, *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō gakkai nenpō* (駒澤大学佛教学会年報; v. 6, no. 2).[49] A second article, aimed at a more popular audience, is titled "Talks about *kesa*" (*Okesa no hanashi* お袈裟の話). I use the text from the first edition of *Zen Talks* (*Zendan* 禅談) published in 1938, a series that was originally published in *Daihōrin* starting in 1935. *Zen Talks* has since been republished a number of times. Modern editions do not include the original drawings and the language has been modernized. The most recent edition was in 1997 and is now in its sixth printing. This collection of lectures about Zen practice is quite readable and, given the number of times it has been republished, appears to be one of the most popular of Sawaki's writings.

In both articles Sawaki highlights a few events in his life that he feels propelled him into a study of the *kesa*. First, he describes his encounter with Fueoka as pivotal, not

only because of this Zen teacher's demeanor and teachings, but because of the robes he wore. In "Talks about *kesa*," Sawaki recalls that Fueoka wore a grey *kesa* made of a cotton-linen fabric called *echigo men* 越後緬 that had plain fabric ties that were folded and blindstitched. These robes made such an impression on the nineteen year old Sawaki that nearly ten years later when he met the two Shingon nuns from Jiun's lineage, he felt a shock of recognition at the similarities between their *kesa* and the one that he had seen Fueoka wearing. The nuns, who lived together in Kichishōan 吉祥庵, a retreat they had built themselves, invited Sawaki to give talks about Dōgen's teachings, a weekly event that he continued for about seven years (Sawaki 1956, 123). One day they brought a copy of Jiun's *Verses on Garments of the Way* and asked him to lecture on this text. Sawaki, thinking that he could easily master the short text, was amazed to find that it was completely opaque to him. This incident made him realize that in order to understand *kesa* he would have to study a great deal more, and he turned to Jiun's longer works on the *kesa* to understand this short work (Sawaki 1956, 123). Sawaki comments about this period in his autobiography:

> At that time, since I had dictionaries for philosophy and Buddhism, I tried hard to use these to look up words, but I could not understand [the text] at all. I realized that the study of *dharma* clothing must begin with the study of Buddha statues. In general, I did not understand the actual *kesa*. I asked the nuns, and they knew nothing about *kesa* scholarship , but they knew the physical *kesa* well. So this time I asked questions of the nuns.
>
> その當時、哲學辭書も佛教辭典も持っていたので、これをたよりに一生懸命に調べたがわからない。そして、法服の研究は、佛像の研究から始めなければならぬということがわかった。だいたい、袈裟の實物をわしは知らない。尼さんに聞いてみると、尼さんはそういう學問こそ知らないが、實

物はよく知っている。それで、今度はわしが尼さんから聞くことになった。(Sawaki 1956, 124)

In this passage Sawaki uses the biographical element of his encounter with the nuns to make the scholastic point that *kesa* research requires more than the standard dictionaries and works on Buddhist thought. Furthermore, it cannot be done with texts alone, but must incorporate Buddhist art as well. In one of his articles on *Proper Dharma Garments* Sawaki recounts the doubts that Sōkō, author of *Field of Merit*, felt when he noticed that his own *kesa*, which used a ring fastening and was made in the scooped shape of the elephant trunk robe, was different from the *kesa* depicted on Buddha statues.[50] When Sōkō asked about the discrepancy, he was told to look at the *kesa* on the statue of the founder of his temple which depicted a ring. Later, when Sōkō went to Nagoya to study, he found that the monks were all wearing robes like the Buddha statue, that is, rectangular *kesa* with ties. This discovery made him resolve to study the *kesa* in more depth (Sawaki 1979, 46.11, 199-200). In a passage from *Zen Talks*, Sawaki comments,

> In the first place, in order to conduct a study of *kesa* we must use old Buddha statues. One must at least go back to the Nara period. We really cannot wear *kesa* with a ring.
>
> そもそも吾々がお袈裟の研究を起こすよいうもの、古い佛像でないといかん。少くとも奈良朝から遡らなければ駄目です。お袈裟に環のついているのは、ほんたうのかけ方が出來ない。(Sawaki 1938, 249-250).

Sawaki's analysis of Sōkō's story makes the point that if *kesa* studies must refer to art, then the problem is which art to study.

Sawaki makes it clear that these two moments in his life, the encounter with Fueoka and the discovery of the textual tradition of *kesa* studies through the nuns, are

linked together by the visual impact of seeing *kesa*. Just as Fueoka's demeanor provided him with a template for the ideal behavior of the monk, his robes provided a model of the ideal *kesa*. Later, after years of military training and active duty, the unexpected sight of the nuns of Kichishōan wearing *kesa* that resembled Fueoka's robes inspired him to study more. Sawaki uses these two incidents in his life to exemplify what he sees as a mysterious connection (*fushigi na en* 不思議な縁) (Sawaki 1956, 120-121). The opportunity of seeing the robes combined with a recognition of their significance, he believes, could only have come about because of deep roots that connected him to the *kesa*.

The latter incident also shows Sawaki's willingness to learn from women and to use their talents in furthering his study of robes. In 1914 he and an elderly laywoman, Kitamura Satoko, went to the Imperial Museum at Nara to see the eighth century dry lacquer statues of the Buddha's disciples (discussed in chapter two above). Sawaki identified the *kesa* depicted on the figures as rag robes, and commented to Kitamura that he would like to wear a *kesa* like these. Kitamura offered to make it for him. They went to Kōkiji to view the rag robes of Jiun's community, but since they could only look at the *kesa* under very controlled circumstances, it was not possible to investigate how they were made. Through Sawaki's connection with the two nuns at Kichishōan, however, they were allowed to borrow one of the rag robes made by Jiun's disciples from Chōeiji 長栄寺 in Kawachi. In order to understand how the robe was put together, Kitamura took apart a section of it, then sewed it back up with the proper back stitch and returned it to Chōeiji. Sawaki notes that Kitamura made the robe out of scraps from her brother's *obi* business, carefully dyeing them first before sewing the pieces together (Sawaki 1956, 126). The incident shows that Sawaki's approach to *kesa* was never merely an academic project, rather, he shows us that from an early age he had a longing for *kesa*. Sawaki

harnessed this acquisitive drive to investigate deeper into the meaning of *kesa.* I now turn to Sawaki's two articles for a more detailed examination of his teachings about sewing the *kesa.*

In his 1936 article, "The Robe and the Dharma are One," Sawaki discusses the important role the *kesa* has had in Japan, beginning with the faith and reverence that Japanese rulers held for the robe. He writes that the bodhisattva Hachiman was shown as a monk wearing a *kesa* and that Prince Shōtoku governed the country wearing a *kesa*. Later, warriors also wore *kesa* in their encampments (*Henshō* 448.1). Sawaki continues the military theme by referring to the *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* promise of victory to soldiers who keep a small piece of the *kesa* and have faith in it. Sawaki does not, however, explain the context of that promise as one of the five vows taken by Śākyamuni in a previous life, nor does he mention the other four vows.[51] He then comments that the custom of taking the word "kesa" as a personal name for luck indicates the reverence that Japanese have long had for the *kesa.*

After establishing the *kesa* as an important artifact of Japanese culture and politics, Sawaki then introduces references to the *kesa* in Zen literature, starting with a dialogue in which Dongshan Liangjie 洞山良价 (807-869) defines the worst suffering as wearing the robe of the Zen lineage without understanding the great matter of Zen.[52] The text of the encounter is found in the chapter on Dongshan in the fifteenth fascicle of the *Record of the Transmission of the Lamp* as follows:

> [Dongshan] asked a monk, what is the most painful thing in the world? The monk answered, "Hell is most painful." The teacher said, "Not so." [The student] asked, "Teacher, what's your idea?" The teacher replied, "To be in the lineage of this robe, and not to have understood the great matter [of birth and death], this is called the greatest suffering."

師問僧、世間何物最苦、僧曰、地獄最苦、師曰、不然。曰、師意如何、師曰、在此衣線下不明大事、是名最苦。(T 51. 323a)

Sawaki translates and comments on each sentence. At the end of the translation he remarks,

(If one) asks the question, "where is the greatest happiness," while one is wrapped up in the *kesa*, though it would take your whole life you would never reach that place. So for us, wearing the *kesa* is the accomplishment of the great matter, and we will arrive at where we are going. To wear the *kesa* and be unable to be satisfied must be the greatest suffering.

袈裟につつまれながら極楽は何処だと訪ねるようでは一生涯かかっても行くべき処に到達し得ないであろう。そうすれば我々はお袈裟を搭けるという事が一大事成就であり、行きつく所まで行きつき得た訳である。お袈裟を搭けて満足出来ぬ事は最も苦しみであらねばならぬ。(*Henshō* 448.1)

Sawaki uses Dongshan's dialogue to express his view that wearing the *kesa* and achieving the goal of Zen practice, the calming of the mind, are firmly linked. In the first sentence he reverses the question in the dialogue from "what is the most painful" to "what is the greatest happiness" thereby suggesting that it is not merely a matter of avoiding hell, but rather of achieving the complete happiness of mind.

Sawaki's commentary on Dongshan's dialogue helps to explain the meaning of his own motto, "Shave the head, wear the *kesa* and sit zazen that's all." It is not that life is reduced to taking the tonsure and the robe and sitting meditation. It is rather that for Sawaki, such a life is the greatest happiness. Sawaki's interpretation, however, collapses the tension in the original dialogue between wearing the robe and yet not understanding the great matter. Dongshan's point is that no matter how content one might be with the

life of a monk, if one does not understand, then it is worse than the pain of hell. Dongshan's response reveals the monk's complacency and drives him forward. In contrast, Sawaki's commentary appears to let us off the hook. In *Talks on the Kesa*, published two years later Sawaki again writes about Dongshan's dialogue. Much of his commentary is as above, but he clarifies his position:

> To desecrate oneself by searching outside of your daily life for the one great matter, this is suffering and it is the daily life of the cycle of rebirth and delusion. Wearing the *kesa* is eating breakfast and eating lunch. To search for the one great matter outside of that while wearing the *kesa* is suffering.
>
> 自分を冒涜して、自分の生活の外に一大事を探すのは苦であり、流轉の生活であり、迷いである。お袈裟をかけるそのことが、飯たり粥たりで、袈裟をかけ乍ら其の外に大事を探すのが苦である。 (Sawaki 1938, 235-236)

Sawaki's position here is that daily life is the realization of the great matter, but at least in this passage it appears to be the daily life of one who wears the *kesa* and sits zazen, that is, the life of a monk.

In a later passage in "The Robe and the Dharma are One," Sawaki raises the topic of sewing the *kesa*. He quotes the following verses as having been written by the twenty-five year old Menzan when he was in retreat at Rōbaian 老梅庵:[53]

> Cutting and sewing the one-shouldered great robe is complete
> From the beginning it is neither cloth nor is it not cotton
> Blue, yellow, red, white mix together
> The foot measure is short, the inch is long, whether hanging, straight, or one sided
> The rag heap glows with the merit of the former Buddhas
> At the tip of the sewing needle, see the transmission of myriad sages

Deportment extends to the limits of the future world

Eternally making great merit for humans and divinities.

一擔伽利裁縫全

從元非布非亦非綿

青黄赤白有回互

尺短寸長垂正偏

糞掃堆輝先佛德

針縫上見萬翁傳

威儀開展未来際

永為人天大福田

(*Henshō* 448.2)[54]

Sawaki neither translates the verses into modern Japanese nor does he interpret the meaning of each line as he had done with Donghan's dialogue. Instead, he observes,

> However you look at it, sewing the *kesa* must already be the accomplishment of the one great matter. Stitch after stitch is truly the import of our school, stitch by stitch has the eternal nature, stitch by stitch is the revelation of the *dharma*. That is, stitch by stitch must go forward to [the next] place. "Stitch after stitch, close and intimate, the head [mind] rises in an instant, the customs of each school vary, practicing in the midst of myriad differences."
>
> かく見るならば、袈裟を縫うという事が既に一大事の成就でなければならぬ。一針一針が実に宗乘であり、一針一針が永遠性をもち、一針一針が法の全露である。即ち一針一針が行きつくべき処まで行きついた事である。「針々密々、頭角忽生、家風別々、異類中行」。(*Henshō* 448.2)

In these remarks, Sawaki makes no comment on themes raised in the verses such as color,

fabric, rag robes or the merit of the *kesa*. Rather, he uses the lines about sewing the robe to emphasize his point that the act of sewing *kesa* is a fundamental teaching of Buddhism and specifically Zen. The rhythmic repetition of "stitch after stitch," each time linking it to the ideals of Zen awakening, gives a glimpse of Sawaki's talents as a public speaker, but this phrase does not even appear in the verses. In addition, he does not explain the origin of the verses presented as a quote at the end of his comments. This quote mixes several well known Zen phrases together.[55] Sawaki quotes Menzan's verses to support his point that sewing the *kesa* is a religious practice but he must overinterpret the poem in order to achieve the effect he wants.

Sawaki's *kesa* lectures and autobiographical writings, his actions and his encouragement of sewing as a practice suggest that Sawaki redefined the *nyohō e* as a *kesa* that is made by hand using the painstaking backstitch as indicated in the *vinaya*, and with a mind of faith, preferably by the person who wears it. In his autobiography, Sawaki explains how his ideal of the *nyohō e* cannot be grasped by commercial robe makers, who had begun to criticize his activities. In his autobiography he relates:

> *Nyohō e* began to be fairly widespread, but then as *nyohō e* began to be made, the first to complain were the commercial robe makers. That was to be expected. The *kesa* was originally a thing made with belief, and must be entirely made using the backstitch. One cannot miss even a single stitch. In the past people did not even dream of that. The gravity of this way of making it would not be appreciated by the business people who do not believe. So, they would not respond to an order [for *nyohō e*] and [we] were strongly criticized by commercial robe makers...
>
> [Those] without belief, without heart, without intelligence, and without connection to the *Buddhadharma* make something that resembles *kesa*, but the *kesa* made by businessmen without heart [just] imitate *kesa*. They are

merchandise. Since [commercial robe makers] have no connection to belief at all, they just regard the idea of making each robe imbued with one's spirit as the sleepy talk of an idiot.

如法衣は隨分と一般に普及しかけたが、さて如法衣を製作するだんになって、まず第一に法衣屋が文句を言い出した。それもそのはずで、元來袈裟は信仰をこめて作るもので、縫うには全部却刺にして一針でも手を抜くなどというようなことは、從來は夢にも考えられなかったであろう。こんな製作の厳粛さが信仰のない職人に好まれるはずはない。だから、彼等は注文に應じようとはしなかった。つまり、法衣屋に大へん評判が悪かった。

無信心、無人情、無頭脳な、佛法と全く関係のない、袈裟に似たものを製造している、心なき職人では、その作った袈裟は袈裟に似たものであり、商品であって、信仰とは全く関係がないのであるから、一衣々々に精根こめて縫うなんてことは、痴人の寝言ぐらいにしか感じられないであろう。

(Sawaki 1956, 238-239)

Sawaki says that for a *kesa* to be considered *nyohō e* it must be made using the backstitch in every part of the robe, and it must be made by one who believes in the *Buddhadharma*. The whole process is an act of reverence for the *dharma*. Throughout the Tokugawa period the main focus was determining the form of the *kesa* that most closely adheres to the *vinaya*, that is, the form prescribed by texts. The claim that only the mind of faith could make a *kesa* according to the dharma was a radical change. Not even Jiun, who promoted *kesa* as a practice among his nuns and laywomen made this kind of claim, and I have seen no evidence to suggest that Jiun developed an antagonistic relationship with those who made *kesa* for a living.[56]

Sawaki's statements indicate that commercial robe makers felt that their livelihood

was being threatened, or at any rate they objected to Sawaki's rhetoric which challenged the authenticity of their robes. Sawaki claims that even if robe makers were willing to invest the time making a robe with the backstitch, the robes would still merely resemble *nyohō e* because they were goods for sale, not an act of belief and reverence.

Sawaki notes that administrators within the Sōtō school also objected to the *nyohō e*, criticizing the practice as disruptive to the rules of the Sōtō school *(shūki ihan* 宗規違犯) and demanding that Sawaki cease teaching at the Nagoya Study Center for Nuns (Sawaki 1956, 65). Similarly, Tanaka (1990 1.65) reports that Yamada Reirin 山田霊林 (1889- ?), who was the director of Sōtō studies (*kyōgaku buchō* 教学部長) of the Sōtō administration (*Sōtōshū shumuchō* 曹洞宗宗務庁) from 1942-1944, went to the Nagoya Study Center for Nuns to verbally warn them that "the *nyohō e* was a violation of the Meiji 22 (1889) unified rules of dress in the Sōtō school."[57] Sawaki's *nyohō e* movement was thus perceived as disruptive to the careful compromise worked out between Eiheiji and Sōjiji in the aftermath of the "three robe controversy." Nevertheless, no statement prohibiting the *nyohō e* was made at the time nor has one appeared in subsequent Sōtō regulations and this form of *kesa* is in fact tolerated within the Sōtō school (Tanaka 1990, 65). Sawaki's determination and his ability to inspire others during this period must have been considerable.

Even more surprising is the fact that Sawaki challenged those in the previous generation who had supported and studied *Proper Dharma Garments*. In his lectures on this text given at Antaiji 安泰寺 in Kyoto in 1964 one year before his death, Sawaki criticizes Gettan and Nishiari as scholars who did not really understand the *kesa:*

> From time to time these people lectured on *Proper Dharma Garments*. Although they did this, they did not understand the *kesa*. It is simply because they enjoyed the literary allusions in *Proper Dharma Garments* that they put energy into the

teaching. I really understand this now. These people did not understand the form of the *kesa,* and they were wrong about the way they wore the *kesa.* In sum, the teaching and the form of the *kesa* must be aligned.

この『法服格正』をときどき請うぜられていた。しかしこの人たちはやってはおられたけれども、本当にお袈裟がわかってやっておられたのではない。それは『法服格正』の枕ことばがおもしろいから、宗乗に力を入れてやられたまでのことである。それがいまになってみると本当によく分かる。ところが、この人たちは袈裟の形というものがわかっていなかった。それであの人たちのお袈裟のかけ方がみな間違うておる。どうしてもこれには事相と理相、つまり宗乗とお袈裟の形とが、ととのわなければならぬのである。(Sawaki 1976, 67-68)

This kind of suspicion of scholarly work runs through Sawaki's writings: unless the scholarship is tethered to the practice of making, receiving and wearing *kesa* it is not true understanding. His comment about making mistakes about wearing *kesa* is telling. In his view, Gettan and Nishiari did not practice what they preached. We now turn to Hashimoto who, although equally dedicated to the ideal of the *nyohō e* presents a very different profile.

Biography of Hashimoto Ekō

Hashimoto was born in Nagoya in 1890, the eldest son of Hashimoto Kichijiro.[58] He received the tonsure at age 14 from Nakamura Renshū 中村聯秀 of Ungoji 雲居寺, located in Tsūshimachi, a town west of Nagoya city. Until the age of twenty-two Hashimoto studied at Zentokuji 善篤寺 under Nakamura Sensō 中村甎宗. In 1912 he began his training under Oka Sōtan at Shūzenji 修禪寺. In the same year he received

dharma transmission from his ordination teacher, Nakamura Renshū, and assumed the position of chief priest at Ungoji, a post he held for the next forty years.

Hashimoto was called upon throughout his life to fill teaching positions at Eiheiji and other major training temples of the Sōtō school. He taught at Gōkokuin 護國院 in Nagoya from 1929-1932; at Eiheiji from 1947-1950; at Zuiōji 瑞應寺 in Ehime, Shikoku in 1951; and at Daijuji 大樹寺 in Tottori province in 1955. In 1961 he became the fifty-second abbot of Hōkyōji 宝慶寺, a branch temple of Eiheiji founded by Jakuen 寂圓 (1207-1299). Hashimoto established the practice of sewing *kesa* among the monks of both Hōkyōji and Zuiōji, a practice that still continues at Zuiōji. Hashimoto was also a frequent lecturer at the Tokyo Eiheiji branch offices (*Tōkyō Eiheiji shutchō sho* 東京永平寺出張所) from 1937 to 1940. After the war Hashimoto gave lectures at the annual Eiheiji *Genzō e* for a total of ten years between 1948 and 1960. Hashimoto also performed week-long precepts assemblies, *zenkai e* 禅戒会, on six occasions between 1949 and 1957.[59]

There were also periods of withdrawal from the public sphere, the most notable of which is his seclusion (*inton* 隱遁) from 1943 to 1947 at the height of the war effort. In 1943, at the age of fifty four, Hashimoto retired from the position of head priest at Ungoji, going into retreat with several of his followers at Nengean 拈華庵 in Aichi ken.[60] In 1947, two years after the surrender of Japanese forces, Hashimoto was appointed Gōdō at Eiheiji. Although he took a second retreat in 1950 at Kaizenji for health reasons, he continued to be actively engaged during that time at both Eiheiji and Zuiōji. Hashimoto's retreat from a public role during the final years of the war could be construed as an expression of his opposition to the war, but I have not yet found any positive evidence of opposition in his own or others' writings.

Hashimoto's teachings on the Kesa

In addition to the joint publication of *Field of Merit* with Sawaki Kōdō in 1922, Hashimoto's prewar publications on the *kesa* include eight essays published in 1938 and 1940 in the journal, *Dōgen*. The first essay, published in three parts during 1938, was "The true spirit of receiving and preserving the *kesa*" (*Kesa juji no shin seishin* 袈裟受持の眞精神) and was based on his lectures at the Eiheiji guest house in Tokyo. In the first essay Hashimoto emphasizes the special place of the robe in Sōtō Zen and outlines the waves of reform that have occurred since the Edo period, indicating his optimism that in his generation the physical form of the *nyohō e* will become the basis of Sōtō Zen practice.[61]

The next six essays are on Mokushitsu's *Proper Dharma Garments,* three of which were published in 1938 and three in 1940.[62] Although Sawaki's popular lecture series on *Proper Dharma Garments* in 1931 predates these, Hashimoto's six articles in *Dōgen* were the first to be published.[63] Hashimoto plunges into detailed explanations without preamble, revealing his meticulous and passionate study of Sōtō Zen writings on the *kesa*. Unfortunately, his plans to write a commentary on the entire text were never realized, and we have only these few articles as an example of the kind of work he was capable of doing. Finally, in November 1940, Hashimoto published an article about priestly garments other than the *kesa*, "Toward a National Policy: a New Form of Clerical Dress" (*Kokusaku sen o iku sōfuku shintaisei* 国策線を行く僧服新体制).

Two of Hashimoto's postwar publications discuss the *kesa* as part of a larger discussion about practice. The first of these is *The Ten Benefits of the Dharma Robe in the Verses in the Stainless Section of the Sūtra of Viewing the Original Mind Ground of the Mahāyāna* (*Daijō honshō shinji kangyō: mukushō bon ge hōe jisshō ri* 大乗本生心地観經、 無垢性品偈法衣十勝利). It was based on lectures given at a week long precepts assembly at Kaizenji in 1963 and was published posthumously by his disciples in 1967. A second work, *Lectures on the Teaching of Receiving the Precepts* (*Kyō jukai bun*

teishō 教授会文提唱), was published by his disciples in 1999, more than thirty years after his death. This work is concerned with Sōtō Zen practice in general, with a short section on receiving the *kesa.*

Although his publication record is lean, these works afford a glimpse of Hashimoto's approach to the Buddhist robe. Hashimoto was dedicated to the physical form of the *nyohō e* as described in the writings of Sōkō and Mokushitsu. He believed that his generation would bridge the gap between texts about the robe and their concrete production by including sewing one's own robes in monastic training. Thus, the rules for the proper color, size and material of the robes would become deeply imbedded in Sōtō practice.

Hashimoto's 1940 essays on Mokushitsu's *Proper Dharma Garments* follow the text closely, explaining the citations from Zen literature and interpreting them in light of his own experience. The first line of *Proper Dharma Garments* refers to an analogy of non-duality, "needle and thread bind together" (*kinshin sōsa* 金鍼雙鎖) from Dongshan's record:[64]

[Title] The Practice of Beating and Calling out together[65]

Armed with needle and thread, bind together

Seamline quietly encompasses all

Seal of the Dharma is the marvel of emptiness

One after another beautiful stitches move forward.

敲唱俱行

金鍼雙鎖備

叶路隱全該

寳印當空妙

重重錦縫開 (T 47.515c)

Hashimoto comments on the extended metaphor of cloth, needle and thread:

> No matter how beautiful the woven cloth is, without a needle and thread you cannot make clothing. Woven cloth is a metaphor for the dharma nature of all phenomena, the needle is Buddha's insight and thread is practice. Just as thread always advances with the needle, practice must advance with the Buddha's wisdom. Wisdom without good practice is like a needle without thread: it destroys the function of the needle. Practice that lacks good wisdom is like a thread without a needle: it destroys the function of the thread. Therefore, with the eye of wisdom and the legs of practice one advances to the pure cool lake. By the study of meditation and wisdom one sees the Buddha wisdom clearly, and sees that understanding rests on practice.
>
> 如何に立派な織物があっても、針と糸とが無くては衣服は出来ぬ。織物は森羅萬象の法性如然たるに喩へ、針を佛知見に喩へ、糸を行に喩ふる。糸は必ず針に伴って進むが如く、行は必ず佛知見に伴ふて進む。善行を伴はぬ知は糸なき針の、針の用をなさぬが如く、善智を欠ける行は、針なき糸の、糸の用をなさぬが如くである。故に智目行足到清涼池といひ、定慧等學明見佛性ともいひ、或は開解立行ともいふ。(Hashimoto 1940.3, 16b)

Hashimoto's analysis is clear but a bit scholastic. The simple equations of cloth and *dharma* nature of all phenomena; needle and wisdom; and thread and practice are fairly static correspondences that could be made by anyone with little experience of sewing. The metaphor has not yet been set in motion. What about the cloth of the Buddha nature of all phenomena? How do we pick up the cloth and begin to sew? Hashimoto's next comments show a deep understanding of actual sewing and a confidence that this physical knowledge will help to unpack these metaphors and make them live. Hashimoto draws attention to Shigetsu's interpretation of the character *in* 隠 as "odayaka" meaning "gentle:"

People who are skilled at sewing in fact move the needle gently, and also quite nimbly. Therefore, the character "odayaka" refers to the condition of ripening...

Each stitch encompasses everything, each practice encompasses everything. To know the principle of the way that clarifies everything is called penetrating to the insight of the Buddha. To practice it is called the ripening of Buddha practice.

裁縫の熟練した人の針の運びは實におだやかでしかも敏捷である。故に隠字は行の熟した状態をいふ。。。

一針ごとに全該し、一行ごとに全該する道理を一切の事に明らめ知るを佛知見に通達するといひ、行ひなるるを佛行の純塾という。(Hashimoto 1940.3, 17a)

In Hashimoto's explanation a skilled sewer who easily and quietly moves the needle through the cloth exemplifies the ease of one whose practice is fully developed. The Buddha way is not strained, it is a matter of gently working the needle through the cloth, and in the hands of a skilled practitioner, every stitch, every practice encompasses everything (*zengai* 全該) and manifests the Buddha's teaching.

Hashimoto then brings up another passage from Dongshan that is concerned with sewing. This passage is from the ninety-third case in Dōgen's *Three Hundred Cases of the Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma* (*Shōbōgenzō Sanbyaku soku* 正法眼藏三百則, DZZ 2.217). This dialogue occurs between Dongshan and Shenshan Sengmi 神山僧密 (fl. 850), who is referred to in the following dialogue as "Teacher:"

Zen teacher Seng-mi was sewing when Dongshan asked, "What are you doing?" Teacher replied, "Grasping a needle." Dongshan said, "Grasping a needle, how is that?" Teacher said, "stitch after stitch resemble one another." Dongshan said, "Twenty years practicing the same, and we're making this kind of talk. What

work this is!" Teacher replied, "Elder, then how is that?" Dongshan said, "It's like the path at the base of a great spewing volcano."

僧密禪師把針ノ次デニ、洞山問フ、什麼作ス。師云ク、把針ス。山云ク、把針ノ事、作麼生。師云ク、針針相ヒ似タリ。山云ク、二十年同行、這箇語話ヲ作ス。豈二與麼工夫アランヤ。師云ク、長老叉タ作麼生。山云ク、大地火發スル底ノ道理ノ如シ。(DZZ 2.217)

Hashimoto explains that in the dialogue Seng-mi shows a contented practice of "stitch after stitch resemble one another" which Dongshan criticizes as not encompassing everything. In spite of Seng-mi's twenty years of practice with Dongshan he has still not become "quiet" (*odayaka*). Hashimoto comments: "We too need the skills of minute investigation." (*gojin mo shinsai no kufū ga iru* 吾人も審細の工夫が要る。 Hashimoto 1940.3, 17). It is not enough to be content with the life of a monk, to enter into a state of calm acceptance while sewing. The sewing itself must include the whole world, requiring the same kind of attention as if the line of stitching were a path at the foot of an active volcano.

Although Hashimoto followed a scholarly tradition, his passion for manifesting these teachings in a concrete form gave him a perspective on the problems of representation and religious practice. He relates that he once carved a statue of Mahākāśyapa showing the rag robes of ascetic practice. He points out that most people think only of the smile on Mahākāśyapa's face when the Buddha raised a flower, but people tend to overlook the practice of asceticism that is the basis of the smile. In his carving, Hashimoto tried to show the asceticism of Mahākāśyapa. He comments, "Aside from whether this little thing attracts the attention of the world or not, this was my own faith." (*watashi no kono isasaka koto ga yo no chūi o kanki shi eru ka inaka wa betsu to shite, kore wa watashi no shin'nen de aru* 私のこの一些事が世の注意を喚起し得るか

否かは別として、是は私の信念である。Hashimoto 1938.2, 6). That is, his faith is not displayed by words alone but is conveyed through the action of representation. To make an image that corrects what he sees as a misinterpretation of Mahākāśyapa is analogous to making a *kesa* that corrects misunderstandings about the form and meaning of the *kesa*.

Hashimoto shows his commitment to the idea that material objects express the immaterial teachings of the Buddha. In one of his articles on *Proper Dharma Garments*, Hashimoto takes on the question of whether the robe and bowl given in transmission are symbols of the teaching:

> The robe and bowl that are given and received with the true transmission of the *dharma* are not merely symbols. As the standard of the *dharma*, the robe and bowl are the *dharma*. Because they are the treasury of the eye of the true *dharma*, when the teaching is passed on from one generation to the next these are included, and so the robe and bowl and dishes are the things of our daily life which we cannot lack even for one day. True Buddhism is not a thing that is separate from actual daily life. Its significance lies in the fact that it is based on actual daily life, and its sole mission is the purification of everyday life...
>
> The robe and the bowl in the world just as it is are not religion, but without separating from everyday life, to purify everyday life gives a hint of the true meaning of religion.
>
> 佛法正傳ノ上に受授される衣鉢は、單なる表徴でなく、佛法の標準として、是の衣鉢が佛法であり、正法眼藏であるといふ事から、大法相続の時に是が附囑され、而もそれが吾々の日常生活に一日も缺くことの出来ない衣鉢と食器とであることに依つて、眞佛教現實生活とかけ離れたものでなく、

實は現實生活を根本から純化することが唯一の使命であることを意味している。

衣鉢は世の中そのまゝでは宗教ではないが、生活を離れず、生活を純化する宗教眞意義が暗示されて居る。(Hashimoto 1938.2, 5 and 7.)

In these passages Hashimoto clarifies the difference between viewing the robe as a symbol of the Buddha's teaching versus understanding the robe as the standard of the teaching. He argues that this can only be understood from the point of view of daily life: if one uses the robe then the robe is the manifestation of the Buddha's teaching. If it is static, just a "thing in the world," the robe is not Buddha's teaching. The idea that the robe symbolizes Buddhism can only arise, therefore, when the robe is separated from Buddhist practice. The robe is not inherently sacred, but if it is active in daily life, then it is the means by which daily life is purified.

Hashimoto was uncompromising in his conception of how Dōgen's practice should be carried out. In the compromise agreement of 1888 Eiheiji agreed to replace the full size five panel *kesa* worn around the body with the *rakusu* which is hung around the neck. Hashimoto mourned the loss of the five panel *kesa* as a violation not only of the Buddha's teaching, but also Dōgen's admonishment to preserve the three robes:

> In the early Meiji period in order to unify the old rules with secularization they eliminated the five panel *kesa*, replacing it with the *rakusu* that is still used today. It must be said that this was done in order to wipe clean the worst stain in the history of our Sōtō school. In so doing, the three robes that the Buddha established became two robes in our Sōtō school, and we who are the distant descendants of the great founder and teacher [Dōgen] have turned our backs on his instruction that "You must preserve these three robes without fail." This

indicates a system which disestablishes the [Buddha's] rules. The rule was crafted out of agreements made by the people of that time, and what they set up was due to their remoteness from the *kesa* in their daily life.

殊に明治の初期に於いて、古規則と世間様の統一を計る為に、五条衣を廃して絡子に換えて今日に至ったことは、我が曹洞宗史上、拭ふべからざる一大汚點を印したものといはざるを得ぬ。かくして佛の制し給ひし三衣は、宗門に於いては二衣となり、高祖の大師の遠孫たる吾人は「この三衣かならず護持すべし」と宣へる祖訓に背くことになった。非制設制とは是の如き制度を指すのであらう。その頃の人の申合わせで規定されたこととは云へ、申合わせが成り立つたといふことはその頃の人が大體御袈裟から遠さかる生活をして居たからである。(Hashimoto May 1938, 6)

From this passage we see Hashimoto's uncompromising stance that Sōtō monks should follow Dōgen's teaching that a monk preserves the three robes. How Dōgen himself preserved the three robes is in fact unknown, so Hashimoto apparently has in mind the teachings of Mokushitsu and Sōkō's works which use the *vinaya* to supplement Dōgen's writings. In his view the *rakusu* is not a legitimate Buddhist garment and should not be substituted for the five panel *kesa*.

Hashimoto recounts a story about Nishiari when he was a young monk training as a head cook.[66] When a fish monger came to the kitchen to sell his wares, he became incensed when Nishiari refused the fish. In the midst of his tirade the fish monger at last noticed that Nishiari was wearing a five panel *kesa* and he retreated in anger, shouting, "This monk's a waste of time - he is doing kitchen work wearing a *kesa*!" Hashimoto comments that the story illustrates how the laity had become unused to seeing priests wearing robes in daily activities. For Hashimoto, the practice of the five panel *kesa* is justified not only by Buddhist history, but is a living tradition practiced by Sōtō teachers in his own lineage.[67]

Hashimoto was not merely stating his preference for a historically correct Buddhist robe. In 1938, Hashimoto wrote of his vision of a Sōtō school that has fully embraced the practice of the *nyohō e* and has purged the heretical compromises that have been wrought on the *kesa* by those who do not practice it in their daily life:

> In "Transmission of the Robe" it says, "the Buddha said those who fall into bad ways hate the great robe (*sōgyari*), and so when they see or hear of the *kesa* hateful thoughts arise. Therefore, when we fall into bad ways, we must arouse the mind of compassion." Because the people of the time had come to hate the *kesa*, a heretical system of avoiding the *kesa* appeared. It isn't merely a question of eliminating the five panel *kesa*. The material, color and measure of the seven and nine panel *kesa* are mixed up according to individual preference, and the manner of mistakenly wearing them according to one's inclinations has gradually obscured the *kesa* over a long time. In these last few years, however, the prospect of reviving the *nyohō e* has begun to dawn. In the capital, the area where it has spread most strongly, a project of reviving the *nyohō e* is now underway. For those of us who have vowed to spread the *nyohō e* there is truly no greater inspiration. I pray that by the great merit of the thought of the Buddhist way the successes of the first and second period will result in a third period of reform. With this opportunity the development of the *nyohō e* in our school will be secured forever.
>
> 正法眼藏傳衣の巻に「佛言、當堕惡道者、厭惡僧伽梨、しかあればすなわち、袈裟を見聞せんところに厭惡の念おこらんには、當堕惡道のわが身なるべしと、悲心を生ずべきなり。」というているが、當時の人が御袈裟を嫌がったから、當堕惡道の袈裟を離れる制度が現出した。五條が廃せられたばかりでなく、七條も體色量は亂れ放題に任せ、搭け方も間違ひ勝手次

第で長い間暮れてきた然るにこの數年來、如法衣が復活される曙光が輝き初めて來た。然も地方へ伝播性の最も強ひ帝都に於いて、如法衣復興事業が着手されることになったことは、如法衣普及を誓願として居る私共は、實に感激の外はない。願はくは諸大徳の御道念によって、第一次第二次にも勝る第三の復興時代を現出して、それを機會に永久に宗門の如法衣化を希つて止まない次第である。(Hashimoto May 1938, 7)

This passage, written in 1938, gives some flavor for the great hopes that Hashimoto and Sawaki had for the future of the *nyohō e* movement. Seven years had passed since Sawaki delivered his lectures on *Proper Dharma Garments* to audiences of as many as six hundred. The nuns at the Nagoya training center were fully involved in making *nyohō e* and here Hashimoto expresses hope that this form will become the official practice of the Sōtō school. Two years later, however, the nascent movement is dealt a heavy blow when the Sōtō school declares the *nyohō kesa* to be against the rules of the school. I have found no indication that Hashimoto was directly warned by the Sōtō administration to stop lecturing on *Proper Dharma Garments*, but after the articles in 1940, his publications on this text stopped.

The Next Generation and the Power of the Handbook

The ordained and lay people who studied and sewed *kesa* under Sawaki and Hashimoto's guidance produced a number of published articles and books as well as practical handbooks that were not published. These materials accomplished what the two founding teachers did not. As more people trained in how to make the robes and learned to teach others, they interpreted and clarified the complex details about making *kesa* and other robes into easily understood diagrams and explanations.

The earliest handbook is Sekito's *The Robe and Dharma of the Buddhas and Ancestors* (*Busso ehō* 佛祖衣法; hereafter, *Robe and Dharma*), published by his disciples after his death in 1934. As noted above, Sekito became an enthusiastic supporter of the *nyohō e* and helped raise the money to buy cloth for the nuns to make robes. *Robe and Dharma* is a selection of texts whose diversity gives a flavor of the early stages of the movement. The first three pages give a topical outline of Dōgen's "Merit of the *Kesa*". The handbook includes selections from *Field of Merit* and *Proper Dharma Garments*; and *Verses on Garments of the Way* (entire). There are also private handbooks and notes from earlier periods. These include an 1827 piece by *vinaya* teacher Chikyō 智鏡 (fl. 1827) of Renkōji 蓮光寺 in Awanokuni 阿州, now Tokujima prefecture, which resembles *Verses on Garments of the Way*, including the instructions to fold the *kesa* in three for the tie placement. Next is a text called *The Nyohōe of the* [*Mūla*] *Sarvāstivāda* 有部如法衣事, apparently written by a commercial robe maker identified as Ribei 利兵 of Takamatsu in Tokushima. A note, "not to be shown to others" follows the title. The text contains pictures for how to make ties, as well as a section on making rag robes of both the far mountain and cloud design. Another private work describes methods of dyeing cloth, written by a person connected with Kōkiji. Finally, there is a handbook of sewing instructions written by Hashimoto. *Robe and Dharma* is thus an unusual collection of published works and private handbooks for making *nyohō e* that has its roots in both Sōtō and Jiun's *True Dharma Vinaya* movement. It is also interesting that it includes the handbook of a commercial robe maker, an indication that there had once been closer ties with professional robe makers.

There may be other nineteenth century handbooks loosely connected to Jiun's movement. One example is a handbook for artists, *Essential Knowledge for Illustration* (*Gazō shūchi* 畫像須知), that describes how to depict the *kesa* in art. The book was

written in 1848 by Nakanishi Seiō 中西誠應 (fl. 1840). It contains a series of drawings that show a monk putting on the *kesa*, and the introduction to the book refers to Jiun's teachings about the *kesa*.[68]

The guide for many contemporary *kesa* sewing groups is *Kesa no Kenkyū* 袈裟の研究, written by Kyūma Echū 久馬慧忠 (1934-) under Sawaki Kōdo's editorial direction and published in 1967. This book gives a clear exposition of the kinds of robes, types of stitching patterns, measurements and types of cloth, interspersing quotes from the *vinaya* and scriptures and illustrating the instructions with clear diagrams. The monastic robe is the main focus, but it also includes directions for making rag robes and accommodating the practice to modern fabrics. The latter part of the book contains a discussion of beliefs about the robe and the identity of the robe and the *dharma*. It is a well written book, nicely balanced between a popular and practical handbook versus scholarly and doctrinal exposition. In addition to *Kesa no Kenkyū*, Kyūma also wrote *Talks on the Kesa: the mind and form of the Buddha* (*Kesa no hanashi: Butsu no kokoro to katachi* 袈裟の話し、仏のこころとかたち) in 1989, which discusses garments other than the *kesa* and includes more discussion of the religious meaning of the *kesa*.

Kyūma has also published articles on Jiun and in 2002 he was asked to be a consultant for the Jiun Onkō Two Hundred Year Memorial Kesa sewing project.[69] Kyūma worked with Shingon teachers and lay volunteers to teach robe sewing to the participants. *Kesa no Kenkyū* served as the guide (with a few minor changes) to this massive effort to produce one thousand *kesa* in two short years to honor Jiun and the thousand robes that his followers had made. Thus, Kyuma's work guides long-standing Sōtō groups and the more recent Shingon groups who have become interested in sewing the Buddhist robe according to Jiun's instructions.

Mizuno Yaoko 水野弥穂子 (1921-), a Dōgen scholar who has published annotated modern language editions of the ninety-five fascicle *Shōbōgenzō,* is also an important figure in the *kesa* sewing movement. Mizuno studied with both Hashimoto and Sawaki and established sewing groups in Tokyo in 1964 which are still active. In 1971 Mizuno published a series of articles titled "Belief in the *kesa*" (*Kesa no shinkō* 袈裟の信仰) in the Sōjiji magazine, *Chōryū* 跳龍. This was followed by a ten article series in 1976 in the journal, *Josei Bukkyō* 女性仏教 that gave detailed instructions for making *kesa.* She also wrote *Talks on 'Merit of the Kesa'* (*Kesa kudoku no hanashi* 袈裟功徳の話し) in 1987, which presents Dōgen's original text, her own modern Japanese translation, and an explanation. The book has become a popular study text for *kesa* sewing groups. Mizuno is seen as a leader of Tokyo area *kesa* groups as a woman who is both an important academic and a believer.

Sekiguchi Dōjun 関口道潤 (1947-) studied with Uchiyama Kōshō 内山興正 (1912-1998), a disciple of Sawaki, and became interested in the question of Gentō and his idea of the *nyohō e.*[70] Sekiguchi investigated what kinds of *kesa* are revered as having been worn by the early founders of Sōtō. He wrote *Research on the Dharma Clothing of Early Groups of Japanese Sōtō Zen* (*Nihon sōtōshū shoki kyōdan ni okeru hōe no kenkyū* 日本曹洞宗初期教團における法衣の研究) in 1992, based on fieldwork that he conducted with the help of the Nagoya area *kesa* sewing teacher, Okamoto Kōbun 岡本光文 (1926-). Sekiguchi expected to find that the *kesa* associated with founding figures of the Sōtō lineage would resemble the form of the *nyohō e* taught by Sawaki. He was surprised to find that many of them were the shape and dimensions of the elephant trunk robe. Sekiguchi carefully measured and catalogued the *kesa,* drew diagrams of them and recorded the traditional accounts of their pedigree which he sometimes questioned. Sekiguchi also included copies of the founders' portraits, many of which show the ring

prominently displayed. Sekiguchi's work illustrates the challenges faced by a person who believes in the authenticity of the *nyohō e*, but gradually realizes that whatever authenticity it has does not rest on traditional practice and is not supported by historical example. This work is important not only because of the record of these revered *kesa*, but also as a record of Sekiguchi's struggle to make sense of this issue and its affect on his own belief.

In her preface to this book, Mizuno Yaoko points out the assumptions about authority that lie behind Sekiguchi's methodology and the difficulty of linking the terminology to historical artifacts. She notes that in Dōgen's time, a *kesa* defined as *nyohō e* was probably made by nuns of the *Four Part Vinaya* lineage, and would naturally differ from the combination of *Four Part Vinaya* and *Mūlasārvāstivada Vinaya* elements used in the modern Sōtō *nyohō e*. She explains that Sekiguchi's hypothesis for determining the early form of the Sōtō robes was to eliminate the elephant trunk robe and other forms such as the great robe with individually lined panels that follow Daoxuan's *Vinaya Revelations*. Sekiguchi thought that this process of elimination would reveal the *kesa* of the early period Sōtō groups, but he eventually had to admit that Dōgen's community in fact wore the elephant trunk robe and used rings in their *kesa*. Mizuno then makes an observation about the use of art in studying robes:

> It is generally thought that the portrait of the teacher [*chinzō*], used as proof of receiving transmission of the *dharma*, is drawn by a special craftsman. Linked to this is the idea that the representation of the robe of a *chinzō* is necessarily accurate. At Hōkyōji and other places the image [of Dōgen] is called a "mirror" and it is thought to be a true representation. The result of valuing the truth of the representation is that one does not see the large eight-sided ring. I wonder if one would understand the particular significance of this representation if the ring were

even a very simple round shape. This book has a place as a departure point for those of us who want to research what Dōgen called the proper robe of transmission.

一般に、頂相が伝法の証として専門の画工によって描かれた事情を考え合わせると、画工としての頂相の「衣相」を要求されていたことが考えられる。その点で宝慶寺の鏡の御影などは、「鏡」と言われるほどに、写実が重んぜられた結果、大きな八角の環が見えず、あっても、ごく簡単な円形の環であるところに、この御影の独特の意味を見出すことができるであろう。本書によって、我々は、道元禅師のいわゆる正傳衣研究の出発点をどこに置くべきかを、はっきりとしめされたと言ってよいである。

(Sekiguchi 1991, 7-8)

Mizuno here points out that the belief in the accuracy of the portrait combined with our ideas about the truth affects how we see. If one holds the firm presupposition that Dōgen must not have used a ring on his *kesa*, then this belief may cloud our perceptions even to the point where we do not see an elaborate eight sided ring on the *kesa* in the portrait. How can we hope to understand Dōgen's thought on the true transmission *kesa* if our faith is shaken even by the presence of a modest, unadorned ring on the *kesa*? The ability to have belief and yet see clearly what is there, even if it contradicts what we believe, is the departure point for study.

Conclusion

As this history suggests, the project of trying to find the form of the *nyohō e* in Dōgen was problematic. In the Tokugawa period, scholar-monks of other schools did not even attempt to link their ideal of the *nyohō e* to the Japanese founder of their school. Their

task was much easier: simply understand and implement the *vinaya* teachings. One could, as in Jiun's case, arrive at a new form by moving beyond Daoxuan's instructions and incorporating elements from various *vinaya* in a new pattern. This does not, however, challenge Daoxuan's own methodology, since he too combined the teachings of several *vinaya* to explicate his favored authority, the *Four Part Vinaya.* These Tokugawa period studies, however, in no way challenged the basic structures of the individual schools.

In the Sōtō school, however, the *nyohō e* movement took Dōgen as the ultimate authority. It did not have to be this way. Yōson provided an example of the kind of research that Sōtō scholars might have done: a careful study of the range of Zen texts and scriptural comments about the meaning and form of the *kesa*. Perhaps it is the fact that Sōtō scholars, who started a century after the first Shingon scholars began to study and write about the *kesa*, missed the period when the ideal of the *nyohō e* was a unifying force. *Kesa* studies had already turned sectarian by the time that Sōtō scholars became actively involved.

From another perspective, the focus on Dōgen meant that the Sōtō school gained the advantage of having to address the issue of what *nyohō e* means as a Japanese practice. When Tōryū wrote about the elephant trunk robe as the true transmission robe there was no disputing the fact that artifacts disprove the belief that Dōgen and the early community must have worn garments that conformed to the *vinaya*. Menzan's criticism of Tōryū's position highlights the predicament: does one use the *vinaya* to unpack Dōgen's meaning, or does one rely on the garments left behind? The emphasis on Dōgen as the source of authority in the modernizing Sōtō school meant that reforms of the robe, whether they emphasized *vinaya* or artifacts, were bound to be ideological and institutional.

Gentō's stubborn passion for a single form of the robe that would express his ideal of the "return to the old ways" became a model for later enthusiasts for the *nyohō e*. His ideal was probably closer to the robes made by followers of Daoxuan, as Mizuno suggests in her preface to Sekiguchi's book. His effort to expunge the ring from Sōtō garments, however, would be hardest to defend, based on the evidence of both art and artifact from the beginning of Sōtō history. Thus, Gentō's argument against the ring was rightly understood as a challenge to the independent traditions that had developed in Sōtō Zen. The conflict that developed nearly split the Sōtō school apart in the mid nineteenth century, not because they valued the *kesa*, but because the customs of their respective lineages were being challenged. The compromise worked out by the two sides in the early Meiji period preserved the Sōtō school, but at the cost, some feel, of the ideal of the *nyohō e*.

Sawaki and Hashimoto both exhibited the kind of fiery dedication to manifesting the ideal of the *nyohō e* as an expression of Dōgen's practice that was last seen in Gentō. In the atmosphere of national solidarity of the 1930s these two teachers transferred a similar hope for a unifying form of the Sōtō *kesa*. The disappointment is palpable in Sawaki's criticism of Nishiari and Gettan, the very people who preserved and published Sōtō scholarship on the *kesa*. In spite of the fact that Sawaki and Hashimoto's activities may have been viewed as threatening the stability of the Sōtō school compromise on forms of dress, the *nyohō e* movement that they inspired survived and grew. The relative success of these small, intimate groups of clerics and lay people is due in part to the fact that in its present form, the movement appears to have lost its ambition for the institutional reform envisioned by Sawaki and Hashimoto. The practice of wearing *nyohō e* is entirely individual among clerics today who wear them at their home temples, but conform to the Sōtō school standards when visiting the main temples. Recently, the

practice of making elaborately stitched rag robes to present to the abbot of one's temple has increased in popularity. The handbooks created by practitioners in the postwar period continue to draw new people to the practice of making *nyohō e* robes.

1. The following discussion relies on Kawaguchi (1995, 100-113).

2. Dōgen refers to the *kesa* verse as a vow, *hotsugan* 發願, in *Rules for Practice Bendōhō* 辮道法:

   ...then face the *kesa* and bow, take it in both hands, and offer it up, resting it on the head. With hands together, say the verses of the vow.

   次ニ袈裟ニ向テ而合掌シテ、両手ヲ以テ袈裟ヲササゲテ以テ頂でいノ上ニ安ク。合掌シテ發願スル偈ニ曰く。(DZZ 2.316).

3. The passage that describes the use of these verses in ordination appears in fascicle nine of *Pure Rules for Chan monasteries* as follows, minus the parenthetical stage directions in the text:

   Leaving home to propagate the great holy path. Vow to cross over [liberate] all people. Ordination teacher takes the *kesa* and chants the verses:

   "Great indeed is the robe of liberation

   The robe is a field of merit without form

   Wearing the precepts of the Tathāgatha

   Extensively saves all beings."

   The ordinee puts on the *kesa* .

   出家弘聖道　誓度一切人

本師持袈裟誦偈云、

大哉解脱服　無相福田衣

披奉如來戒　廣度諸衆生

沙彌披袈裟訖 (Z 2:16, 462d; Kagamishima 1972, 305).

4. For example, the verses do not appear in Daoxuan's *Chapter on Buddhist Garments* (T 45 no. 1894).

5. The "old Buddha" refers to Rujing.

6. As described in chapter three, the five vows in *Compassionate Lotus Scripture* declare that in Śākyamuni Buddha's teaching, first, backsliding monks who wear the *kesa* may still receive a prediction of awakening if they repent and have a thought of reverence toward the Buddha, Dharma and the community of monks; second, if there is one among heavenly beings, low caste people and hungry ghosts who venerates the robe, and glimpses it, then this being will not backslide in his practice of the three vehicles; third, if any of those suffering from hunger and thirst get even a small part of the robe, then their hunger will be satisfied; fourth, when beings come into conflict with each other, if even one recalls the robe to mind, then its virtue will cause his mind to become compassionate, pliant, non-aggressive, liberated and controlled; and fifth, if a person finds himself among those who intend to resolve matters through conflict, if he has even a small piece of the robe that he has respectfully worshipped, then he will be protected from harm and will be ultimately triumphant.

7. Yōson received *dharma* transmission from Tetsuzan Shinyō 鉄山心養 (fl. 1660), the

13th abbot of Kenshōji 見性寺. Kawaguchi (1976, 363-364) identifies Yōson as a Sōtō cleric although Kawaguchi suggests that Yōson's writings on various scriptures led others to believe that he was affiliated with Tendai or Rinzai lineages.

8. I have left out the following sentence, which roughly translates as "they place the corner of the collar on their head" (*chōjō kinkaku ritsu* 或頂上襟角立). I have not yet determined what this practice might be. Kawaguchi also leaves it out of his translation, which reads as follows:

> In our country the style of all the schools is in disarray. They wear purple robes and crimson robes or attach tassels to the *kesa*, and boast of their beautiful silk clothes.
>
> 我が國の諸宗は袈裟の様式が乱れ、紫衣や緋衣を着たり、あるいは袈裟に房をつけたり、絹物の華麗さを誇ったりしている。(Kawaguchi 1976, 361)

9. Yōson's chronology follows the setting of the story or event, rather than a strict chronology of textual sources. For example, at the beginning of the text he uses Japanese tale literature rather than Indian Buddhist texts to tell the story of Prince Siddhārtha receiving his first *kesa* from the god disguised as a hunter.

10. Kawaguchi (1976, 364) comments that Yōson did not receive transmission from Tanshin, and that this gift of a *kesa* was not meant to be a transmission robe.

11. Kawaguchi (1976, 364; 367) explains that Tōryū's original work is no longer extant, but its content is preserved in *Easy Teachings from the Chapter on the Elephant Trunk Transmission Robe* (*Den'e zōbi shōkō haka* 傳衣象鼻章稿巴歌, ZSSZ

2.600-637), published in 1808 by Daisen Tamashū 大泉玉州 (1739-1814), a cleric in Tōryū's lineage (fourth generation). In the modern edition, quotations from Tōryū's original text in indented passages alternate with Daisen's comments. Daisen also wrote his own commentary on the robe, *Questions and Answers on the Secret Explanation of "Transmission of the Robe" and "Merit of the Kesa" in the Shōbōgenzō* (*Shōbō genzō den'e kudoku setsukai mondō* 正法眼藏傳衣功徳竊解問答), but Kawaguchi (1976, 367) believes that this work is no longer extant. Tōryū did not invent the expression "elephant trunk robe," which was current during the Tokugawa period. The origin of the term is not clear, as the following discussion will show.

12. For a discussion of the movement to "return to the old ways" in Sōtō Zen, see Kagamishima (1985, 155-168). For an English language discussion see Riggs (2000, 84-130). For a history of Daijōji in the early period of the Sōtō Zen school see Bodiford (1993).

13. I am using a literal translation of this unusual and relatively unusual phrase. A more frequently used counter word for *kesa* is *ryō* 領, but it is possible that the glyph 頂 (*chō*) refers to the ritual act of receiving the robe in different contexts. The glyph appears in the compound used to translate the Sanskrit word, *abhiṣeka* (Japanese, *kanjō* 灌頂), where it indicates the aspersion of water on the head in the ritual of esoteric initation or consecration. One also receives the *kesa* on one's head in rituals of ordination and transmission. Modern scholars have interpreted the phrase in various ways that reflect these two ritual situations. Mizuno (1970, 1.197) notes that the expression *itchō e* refers to the *kesa* that one receives once on one's head, that is, the ordination robe. In contrast, the entry for "itchō e" in

ZGD (1978, 47a) defines this term as the *kesa* that is properly transmitted. It adds that this *kesa* is also referred to as the gold brocade robe, *kinran e* 金襴衣, and as Bodhidharma's blue-black cotton robe, *kutsujun* 屈眴. Which of these types of *kesa* should be the sole model for the transmission robe, however, was a matter of dispute during this period. The entry for "itchō e" in BGD (1981, 65a) states that "itchō" is a counter word used when one is wearing a hat (i.e., ceremonial dress). This definition, however, cites Dōgen's "Transmission of the Robe," so it is inconclusive. The only other place where I found this expression is after Dōgen's lifetime where it appears in the section on transmission in the collected verses of Kurin Seimo 古林清茂 (1262-1329) of the Rinzai lineage. Although Seimo's five volume record was published in 1325, shorter works were published as early as 1309, including a selection of his verses, *shuigeju* 拾遺偈頌 (see *Zoku zōkyō* 2.28.3; and "kurin mo zenji goroku" in ZGD 254c).

14. Also see "tate ni sansai o kiwame yoko ni jippō ni amaneshi" 竪究三際究横アマネシ十方 in ZGD 828d.

15. Kawaguchi does not explain how he arrived at these measurements, and I have not yet found a clearer explanation of any measurement system in Tōryū's *Elephant Trunk Robe*. Jiun compares twenty-one historical *shaku* rulers from China and Japan that range in size from about 5.5 to 7.5 inches (compared to the modern measure of about 15 inches), but none of these use the kind of terms that Tōryū uses. It may be that Tōryū is more specific in his *Critique of Ordination Questions* where he describes how to wear the elephant trunk *kesa*. More work needs to be done to clarify these questions about measurement.

16. The passage in Chinese reads: 彿言聽以長四肘廣二肘衣作安陀會。廣三肘長五肘作郁多羅僧僧伽梨亦如是。

17. See chapter four for a description of this method of backing the great robe.

18. The data for this section relies on Sekiguchi Dōjun (1992), who conducted a survey of *kesa* held in Sōtō Zen temples that are believed to date from the earliest period of Sōtō Zen. He provides information about the dimensions, shape, cloth, color and fastenings of each of these robes and analyzes the traditional claims to antiquity and ownership. I discuss this work in the last section of the chapter.

19. "Gyōji" is number sixteen and seventeen of the sixty fascicle *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma.* "Transmission Document" is number thirty nine of the seventy-five fascicle version.

20. As we saw in chapter two, the inscription on the Enryakuji *kesa* states that it belonged to Saichō's teacher's teacher.

21. *Proper Dharma Garments* defines the violation of making the leaf of the tāla tree as letting the two corners hang down in front (Kawaguchi 1976, 133).

22. Alternatively, the entry for "shidai kōsetsu" in Bukkyō go daijiten (1981, 527a) lists the four as: scriptures, *vinaya*, abhidharma and precepts.

23. Menzan uses the glyph 剜 for the word "eguru" which means to scoop out. He also uses the compound *dankyaku* 壇隔, which refers to the full length and width of a panel, including the seams.

24. Menzan explicitly uses the expression, "not according to the dharma" (*fu nyohō e*) in

reference to the elephant trunk robes at *gozan* temples: "...because these are all a violation of the Buddha's rule, they are not *nyohō e.*" (*kore mina bussei ni ihai suru tokoro no funyohō e nari* コレミナ佛制ニ違背スル處ノ不如法衣ナリ。)

25. Kawaguchi mentions this text but does not provide bibliographic information for it. Komazawa University library lists a typewritten copy of the text in their catalogue, but lists publication information as "unknown." I have not been able to obtain a copy of this work.

26. The following sketch of the movement to "return to the old ways" is based on Kagamishima (1985, 155-191). Baroni (2000, 103-105) discusses the impact of the *Ōbaku Pure Rules* on Japanese Zen. For the text of the pure rules, she refers the reader to the collected works of Yinyuan Lungzhi 隱元 隆琦(1592-1673), the Chinese founder of the Ōbaka school in Hirakubo (1979): vol. 3.

27. Kagamishima (1980, 188-190) points out that Gentō's position on pure rules was not entirely anti-Ōbaku and that he took a more nuanced approach of adapting the rules to changing times. For example, although Gentō strongly criticized Manzan, he did not attack Gesshū's approach.

28. See Williams (2000, 49-61). The three liaison temples were: Daichūji 大中寺 in Ibaraki prefecture, Ryūanji 竜穏寺 in Saitama prefecture and Sōneiji 総寧寺 in Chiba prefecture.

29. Kawaguchi simply states that this was Gentō's intention, without providing a source. I have not been able to find any reference to the ring in Gentō's works on monastic rules in the *Shingi* volume of ZSSZ 2.309-342.

30. See also the portrait of the Rinzai master, Musō Sōseki 夢窓疎石 (1275-1351), at Rokuōin 鹿王院 in Kyōto (Izutsu 1965, 90). The portrait shows a large ivory ring fastening over the left side of the chest.

31. Kawaguchi cites Sawaki's essays on "Merit of the Kesa" (*Sawaki Kōdō zensho* 1964, 6.254 and 288).

32. Kawaguchi (1976, 323) quotes a passage from Daoxuan's *Notes on Rituals of the Four part Vinaya* (*Ssufen lü jiemo shu* 四分律羯磨疏), citing Manzoku 64.4.61右上. I do not have access to this text at this time.

33. Perhaps Jiun "won the war," however, because Sawaki and Hashimoto adopted this method for the tie placement on their *nyohō kesa*. Kawaguchi cites Hase (1929, 19) as the source of this information. It seems unlikely, however, that merely the placement of ties would lead to this censure. More research will be necessary to discover the reasons why Jiun was criticized.

34. Kawaguchi cites the *Edo period Essential Rules for Sōtō* (*Edo jidai Tōmon seiyō* 江戸時代洞門政要) collected in the *Kojiruien* 古事類苑 (1938, 36.112).

35. For the original text of the Sōtō response see Kawaguchi (1984, 169-170).

36. There are several names for this garment, including: *kasu* 掛子 and *kara* 掛羅 or 掛絡. Mochizuki writes that the term does not appear in *vinaya* texts, rather, that these names are all from vulgar Chinese. See "gojō kesa" in BD, 1256-1258.

37. Dōgen describes Rujing's teaching in talk number 26 of *Record of the Hōkyō era* (*Hōkyōki* 寶慶記, DZZ 2.380). Dōgen's comments about the use of the *henzan*

and the *jikitotsu* appear in the fascicle, "Washing" (*senjō* 洗浄) from *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma.* This suggest that the Song period *jikitotsu,* which was introduced to Japan by Eisai, was used as daily garb in Dōgen's own community (DZZ 1.469-470).

38. Kawaguchi (1977) offers evidence that this work was in fact written by Mokushitsu.

39. These materials are prohibited in fascicle thirty-one of the *Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya* (T. 22.484b). See Kawaguchi (1976, 193).

40. Unfortunately, Kawaguchi does not tell us the source of this report of portrait vandalism or which paintings they were.

41. See Kawaguchi (1976, 382-390) for a detailed discussion of the various copies of the text.

42. Morita was a native of Owari, Aichi prefecture, the seat of Sōtō Zen scholar-monks working on Dōgen's *Treasury of the Eye of the True Dharma.*

43. The most recent edition of this handbook was published in 1988 by the research division of the *Sōtō shū shūmuchō* 曹洞宗宗務庁 as *Shōwa Shūtei Sōtō shū gyōji kihan* 昭和修訂曹洞宗行持軌範. Morita became the sixty fourth abbot of Eiheiji in 1891 and during his tenure he rebuilt the Monks training hall (*sōdō* 僧堂) and the Buddha Hall (*butsuden* 佛殿) and presided over the 650th memorial of Dōgen. He is said to have given the precepts (*jukai* 授戒) to hundreds of thousands of people. His talks are collected in a six volume set entitled *Record of Daikyū Goyu Zenji* (*Daikyū Goyu Zenji kōroku* 大休悟由禅師廣録).

44. In addition to Oka's five years, Hashimoto Ekō lectured for ten years: 1948-1950

and 1954-1960; Oka Kyūgaku 丘球學 (1877-1953) for four years: 1939-1940, 1943 and 1952; and Kishizawa Ian 岸沢惟安 (1865-1955) for thirteen years: 1919-1931. Kamatani Senryū 鎌谷仙龍 (fl. 1970), Hashimoto's disciple, lectured six years: 1969-1974. This adds up to a total of thirty eight years.

45. Temples where Oka maintained a teaching residence were: Dōunji 洞雲寺 in Gifu; Yōgenji 養源寺 in Hyōgo; Shuzenji 修禪寺 in Izu (now Shizuoka prefecture); and Daijiji 大慈寺 in Kumamoto prefecture. The name of Sōtō shū University was changed to Komazawa University 駒澤大学 in 1925.

46. Biographical details are drawn from various sources, including the ZGD, 387a; Tanaka Tadao 1990; Sakai Tokugen 1974; and Sawaki Kōdō 1938 and 1956, on which much of Tanaka and Sakai's biographies rely. These biographies are widely available. When quoting Sawaki I use his 1956 work, *Living in Zen* (*Zen ni ikiru* 禅に生きる).

47. "Itinerant Temple" gives a clearer picture of Sawaki's activities compared to the sobriquet of "homeless Kōdō," made popular in the West by Uchiyama Kōshō who published some of Sawaki's lectures in 1972 under the title, *The Zen Teaching of Homeless Kōdō.* A revised edition was published in 1981 by the Kyoto Zen Center.

48. The subject of Sawaki's activities during the war and its relationship to his teachings about Zen is too complex a topic for this short biographical profile. Brian Victoria briefly quotes Sawaki's reminiscences about the 1904 Russo Japanese war and his observations about the need for cooperation and communal action in the years before World War II, but he does not describe Sawaki's activities during

this time (Victoria 1997, 35 and 184).

49. I was unable to obtain a copy of this volume of the journal, but Kuruma Shōgyō of Kannon'in in Tokyo gave me a privately circulated reprint edition of the first seventy issues of *Henshō* that includes Sawaki's article, labeled number 448. As far as I know this reprint is not generally available. Interested readers may be able to obtain a copy of the original journal article.

50. Kawaguchi (1984, 7) states that Sōkō studied under Chingyū of Banshōji and in the lineage of Kōsen Mujaku 黄泉無著 (fl. 1800) of Daikōin 大光院.

51. Similarly, in "Talks about *Kesa*" published in 1938 Sawaki again concentrates on this one vow without explaining the context.

52. The Sōtō school traces its origins to Dongshan and his disciple, Caoshan Benji 曹山本寂 (840-901).

53. These verses do not appear in Menzan's *Guidelines for Dharma Robes of Buddhist Monks,* and I have not yet found it in his other works.

54. Based on the context of the line, I am interpreting *ittan* 一擔 as referring to the robe worn on one shoulder. The way the term is used here does not have the negative implications of *ittan zen* 一擔禪, which refers to incomplete awakening in which one is still holding something back. See "ittan zen" in ZGD 46d. The compound *gyari* 伽利 is an abbreviation for great robe, or *sōgyari* 僧伽梨, also 僧伽利; see "sōgyari e"and "sōgyari" in BGD 1981, 874b and c respectively.

55. I found that the following phrases appear independently but not together in Buddhist and Zen literature: "practicing in the midst of differences," "stitch, intimacy" and

"horns rise from the head (in an instant)."

56. Although I have not read all of Jiun's works on the *kesa*, the sections that I have read would probably have contained such ideas.

57. Tanaka notes that he is repeating a conversation he had with Kawaguchi Kōfū. He qualifies this report by saying that Kawaguchi was a student of Sawaki Kōdō.

58. The following biographical sketch is based on the outline provided by his disciples in Hashimoto (1999, 281-282).

59. These precepts assemblies were held at Ungoji in March, 1949; at Kaizenji in 1952 and 1961; at Jōdo ji in Shimane prefecture in 1953; at Taizōji, Nagoya in March; at Daijūji, Tottori prefecture in August, 1954; and at Zuiōji in Ehime, Shikoku in 1957.

60. Nenge-an is located in Heiwa chō 平和町, Nakajima county 中島郡.

61. The issues of *Dōgen* that contain the essays are: February, 2-10; April 2-5 and May, 6-10, 1938.

62. The title of the essays is *Lectures on Proper Dharma Garments* (*Hōbuku kakushō kōwa* 法服格正講話), published in *Dōgen* 1940 in the following issues: March, pages 15-20; May, pages 27-32; and June, pages 27-32.

63. Sawaki's essays on this text were not published until after his death, and were based on a lecture series given at near the end of his life at Antaiji in Kyoto in 1964.

64. Mokushitsu's opening line is: "the precious seal of the very emptiness" (*tōkū no hōin* 當空ノ寶印). Hashimoto identifies this line as a quote from a poem in the

Record of Dongshan. His interpretation of these lines is based on a commentary by the Sōtō scholar-monk, Shigetsu Ein 指月慧印 (1689-1764). In 1761 Shigetsu published the records of Tōzan and Sōzan under the title *The Record of Two Teachers* (*Sōtō nishi roku* 曹洞二師録). A different source is provided by Kawaguchi, who attributes Mokushitsu's opening line to the first fascicle of the *Record of Hongzhi* (宏智禅師広録, T 48.3c; Kawaguchi 1976, 6) . Hongzhi Zhengjue 宏智正覺 (1091-1157), a teacher of the Caodong (Sōtō) school, is credited with reforming the rules for Zen monks and was opposed to the use of *kana* Zen in which a single phrase is used as a means for focusing the mind. The passage that Kawaguchi cites, however, replaces the word "emptiness" (*kū* 空) with "style" (*fū* 風), so I am following Hashimoto and Shigetsu's interpretation here.

65. My translation is based on Hashimoto's explanation in this essay. Shigetsu identifies the title of the verse as a line from Donghan's *Jewel Mirror Samadhi* (*Hōkyō zammai* 寶鏡三昧). Powell (1986, 64) translates this line as, "rhythm and song arise together."

66. Hashimoto credits Kishizawa Ian with this story.

67. Koun Franz, an American Zen student who practiced at Zuiōji for several years reports that photographs at Zuiōji show Hashimoto wearing a full size five panel *kesa* while cleaning the temple. He also demonstrated how to tie up the five panel *kesa* so that it is protected while one works (Koun Franz, personal communication 2006).

68. This book is owned by Columbia University and Harvard Yenching Library in the

U.S., and by Taishō University and Ryūkoku University in Japan.

69. The *Jiun Sonja Two Hundred Year Memorial Robe Sewing Project* (慈雲尊者二百期遠忌「千衣裁縫発願」) involved Shingon temples throughout Japan. Participants gathered at their local temples to sew Buddhist robes, producing over one thousand robes in honor of Jiun. In January 2004 I sent out a two page survey to the nearly 1000 participants in the project and am currently analyzing the results, to be published in the near future.

70. Sekiguchi's temple is Erinji 恵林寺 in Ichinomiya city

Conclusion

This study of the Buddhist robe in Japan reveals aspects of the complex and dynamic relationship among text, art, and garment. As I discussed in chapter two, Buddhist robes and their depiction in art established a precedent for the Japanese understanding of what these garments were long before the written texts that prescribe their form became an important aspect of Japanese Buddhist practice. These material forms influenced later developments and are still regarded as authoritative by many of the interpretive communities discussed in this research. The textual critiques mounted by Tokugawa scholar-priests sought to privilege the *vinaya* descriptions, which were comparatively recent voices in Japan, over garments and artistic representations that for centuries had dominated notions of the Buddhist robe.

One example of the complex relationship between texts and Buddhist garments is the shift in naming conventions for the *kesa* that were preserved at Hōryūji and the Shōsōin. Since 660, when Saimei ordered a ceremonial reading of the *Benevolent Kings Scripture*, robes of this type were referred to as pieced robes (*nōe*; *nōgesa*), following the textual prescriptions of the scripture that call for *nōgesa* to be given to priests who perform its ritual for preserving the state. The ancient name of *nōgesa* was replaced, however, by the term for rag robes, *funzōe,* in nineteenth century catalogues for public exhibits of the ancient Hōryūji *kesa*. In chapter four I discussed how Jiun and his followers may have contributed to this shift by identifying the revered artifacts of the Shōtoku and Śākyamuni *kesa* from Hōryūji as *funzōe*, thereby providing a new interpretation of their meaning and changing their value in Buddhist sensibility.

The ideal of the rag robe as the robe that Śākyamuni Buddha himself wore evokes powerful emotions of nostalgia in Buddhist communities and inspires devotion to the *kesa*. Resacralized as rag robes, the meaning of these artifacts shifted away from the

rituals of early state Buddhism toward their new identity as rag robes of the Buddha. Jiun's community also identified a number of their own hand-made robes as rag robes, thus popularizing the difficult term *funzōe*, literally translated as "shit wiping robe." Jiun taught his followers, many of whom were from the higher ranks of society, to regard the ancient textiles and the multi-colored pieced robes they were producing as rag robes not unlike those worn by the historical Buddha in India. Jiun's reevaluation of these ancient artifacts as rag robes occurred very shortly before these garments were purchased by the Meiji era monarchical government, later to be installed at the Tokyo National Museum as objects of national pride.

In chapter two, I discussed another aspect of the identification of the *kesa* with the state in Kamakura era portraits of Shōtoku. Showing multiple layers of ambiguous garments these portraits help to dissolve the boundaries between priest and ruler. Shōtoku wears a highly ornate priestly *kesa* over his left shoulder, and a rectangular *ōhi* worn on the opposite shoulder, which appears to balance or even oppose the *kesa*. Underneath these garments Shōtoku wears ornate lay robes and his hair is untonsured. As the model of the ruler and promoter of Buddhism in the early state, the image of Shōtoku is complex and multi-layered, and his garments literally portray the layering of these many roles.

While the *kesa* developed a powerful identity as the garment of both kings and priests, literary works portrayed ambiguities in the religious meaning of the garment. Although Japanese Buddhists expressed the idea that the *kesa* is imbued with the merit of the Buddha's teaching, the garment itself might hide the murderous intentions of the hunter or the impure heart of the false monk. Expressions of ambivalence toward the *kesa* that appear in tale literature and in Buddhist writings of the medieval period were part of the process of accepting the *kesa* in Japanese culture. As the story of Prince

Siddhārtha receiving his first *kesa* in *Times Now Past* shows, the garment worn by the hunter is instantly identified as the sacred *kesa* of the Buddhas by the prescient and authoritative young prince. There is a parallel between this confident Siddhārtha and legendary stories and portrayals of Shōtoku in which a young man of sixteen is shown as having knowledge of Buddhism and a certainty beyond his years. In *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma*, the robe alone remains a sign of the Buddhist monk as the efficacy of the precepts and the teaching fall away. There is also a remarkably positive view of the *kesa* absorbed from texts such as the *Compassionate LotusScripture*, and in popularizations of various tales of the protective power of the *kesa*. The *kesa* that appear in these literary treatments, however, are abstract entities, as if portraying the power or merit of the *kesa* were incompatible with its physical characteristics.

As scholar-monks began to write about the *kesa* as described in the *vinaya*, the relationship between the physical garment and its religious meaning were brought to the fore. As I showed in chapter four, Tokugawa period monks dedicated to establishing Daoxuan's teachings in Japan confronted what they now viewed as contradictions between these ancient prescriptions and the Japanese tradition of Buddhist garments. Their efforts to conform to these rules in their own manner of dress at first attracted admiration, but later these monks were criticized as too narrowly focused on rules. The initial ideal of a monastic robe that would unite Buddhist priests under one standard gave way to the increasing sectarianism of the later Tokugawa period. At the same time, the monks who sought to conform to the *vinaya* were accused of allowing their dull cotton and linen robes to proclaim their virtue rather than being truly good themselves. Like the tale literature of the medieval period, these Tokugawa era criticisms reveal an ambivalent attitude toward the *kesa* which might well disguise a false monk.

In contrast, Jiun took a more nuanced position that incorporated aspects of the

Japanese tradition with careful reading of the texts. Jiun used his study of the *kesa* to educate his followers about Buddhism and to inspire them to make robes modeled on ancient textiles and on his conception of the "robe in accord with the *dharma*." Jiun balanced knowledge of the *vinaya* with respect for the traditions and the material culture of Japan. He treated its art and artifacts as an authentic expression of Buddhism, investing them with an authority nearly equal to that of the *vinaya* texts. His genius lay in his ability to forge a path through the contradictions between ancient texts and Japanese traditions and thereby convince his followers that they too were living the teachings of the Buddha. Jiun thus helped to complete the indigenization of Buddhism begun by tale literature through his convincing scholarship and his mastery of the Japanese material culture of robes.

Perhaps Jiun went too far, however, in designating as *funzōe* the ancient Japanese *nōgesa* and the *kesa* modeled on these artifacts that were made by his followers. During Jiun's lifetime and within his lineage the ambiguity between the old term *nōe* and the newly revived term *funzōe* could be ignored, but as his teachings spread through Sawaki's *nyohō e* movement in the twentieth century, the inconsistency between the *vinaya* description of rag robes and the hand sewn robes that participants make became more apparent. I addressed this question previously when I published my fieldwork in 2004, but more work needs to be done on this issue. I found that in contemporary *kesa* sewing groups there is an uneasy sense that the rag robes they make from old kimono are, from a religious point of view, merely an imitation of the Buddhist ideal of using filthy rags to make robes.[1] In chapter two I pointed out semantic distinctions preserved in names such as *kenda kokushi* and *nōe* or *nōgesa* that were ascribed to multi-colored pieced *kesa*. These names seem to indicate that at one time the distinction between the rag robe and the monastic robe made of multi-colored scraps of fabric was recognized and maintained.

I suspect, however, that this analysis will have little effect on contemporary religious communities who produce these robes, or the textile historians and museum curators who continue to interpret these robes as *funzōe.* The evocative "shit wiping robe" is too well entrenched to be replaced by the more correct but less inspiring "multi-colored pieced robe," even at the cost of the uneasy sense that these beautifully made "rag robes" are merely a gesture towards the ascetic practice that produced the rag robes of Śākyamuni Buddha and his disciples.

Ironically, two priests of the Sōtō school revived and reinterpreted Jiun's teachings about the Buddhist robe in the modern era, not the priests from his own Shingon school. Jiun's model of educating both ordained and lay of both sexes about the *kesa* and inspiring them to make *kesa* in the context of religious practice was followed by Sawaki during the 1930s. Sawaki also used the actual *kesa* made by Jiun's community as a model for the rag robe made by his own followers. Although much scholarship about the *kesa* had been written by Sōtō priests, the implementation of these teachings did not occur until Sawaki and Hashimoto began lecturing about these works and promoting a method of sewing *kesa.* Their movement follows the approach to *kesa* advanced by the Tokugawa Sōtō scholar monks, Menzan, Gentō, and Mokushitsu that incorporated *vinaya* teachings to supplement Dōgen's teachings on the *kesa.* The use of *vinaya* teachings to clarify Dōgen's teachings was not, however, accepted by all parties in the Sōtō school.

In chapter five I showed how existing artifacts have the power to shape one's view of the *kesa.* Tōryū held that Dōgen's teaching about the *kesa* could be understood by examining the artifacts of the Sōtō school and the revered transmission *kesa* of *gōzan* temples. These garments, he argued, should have precedent over the teachings of the *vinaya* which he viewed as inappropriate for Zen monks. Tōryū took Dōgen's criticism of Daoxuan's reliance on heavenly visions as an indictment of the *vinaya* itself and limited

his sources to artifacts and the writings and portraits of Dōgen, Keizan, and other eminent Sōtō teachers. Tōryū argued on the basis of this physical evidence that the warped geometry of the extant "elephant trunk" robes was the authentic form of the transmission robe. The most authentic Zen robe would therefore differ on every point from the form, color and material of the robe according to the *vinaya.* Tōryū's view prevailed among temples affiliated with Daijōji even though Menzan sharply criticized Tōryū's methodology and conclusions. In contrast, modern Sōtō school *kesa* sewing teachers, because they follow the work of Menzan, Mokushitsu and Jiun, look to the *vinaya* rules for details of the physical robes, even though they too rely on artifacts and art. As Sawaki points out, the vital question is which art can be taken as an authority on the *kesa.*

The inclination to refer to the *vinaya* as the most authoritative source affects modern Japanese scholarship, which continues to focus on textual descriptions of Buddhist robes. Kawaguchi's work, which has been invaluable for this research, nevertheless contains some of the same criticisms of gold brocade robes and Japanese adaptations that are seen in Sawaki and Hashimoto's writings. His discussion of the debate between Menzan and Tōryū, although brief, clearly sides with Menzan, without addressing the larger issue of the difference in methodology of these two teachers. The *Zengaku daijiten*, widely respected as an authoritative source of information about Zen teachings and traditions, displays a similar bias. For example, the photograph accompanying the entry for "rakusu," shows a garment made in the Sawaki style, even though most *rakusu* are not made this way ("rakusu" in ZGD 1259).

Modern Japanese scholarship about the robe is so strongly focused on *vinaya* teachings that it is difficult to study the significance of the robe in the realm of Japanese religious culture itself. Instead, one finds oneself drawn into discussions about the disparity between what the *vinaya* teaches and the actual robes and their artistic

depictions found in Japan. The exception to this tendency are the descriptive studies by commercial robe makers such as Izutsu and Kaen that discuss the history and particular forms of Japanese robes. The emphasis on the *vinaya* in Japanese Buddhist scholarship on the robe, which dates to the Tokugawa, means that Buddhist scholars in Japan are not drawn to interpreting historically significant artifacts, art and practice in Japan. This important part of Buddhist studies is therefore left to textile historians and museum curators.

<u>Topics for Further Research</u>

One topic that deserves further examination is how the *kesa* can serve as an introduction to Buddhist teachings, something that was clearly seen in Jiun's community. The *Thousand Robe* record shows that women took leadership roles and experimented with different modes of practice in sewing the *kesa*. This record can be further mined for information about Jiun's community by looking at who made robes and who received them; and by analyzing the dedications and data concerning the robes. A related project is an analysis of a survey that I conducted in 2004 of participants in a project to sew one thousand kesa for the two hundred year memorial of Jiun. With the help of Soeno, abbot of Daimonji in Ibaraki city, I sent nearly a thousand surveys to the participating temples for distribution, and received a 60% return rate. Volunteers helped to digitize the results. The survey asked questions about the participants' age, family and temple affiliation as well as questions about sewing experience and specific questions about the project. A final open question asked participants for their comments. A number of women who filled out these questionnaires wrote that this was the first time they had ever been asked for their opinion. In the memorial project and in *Thousand Robes* women acquired knowledge of the meaning of Buddhist robes and took leadership and teaching roles. Data from *Thousand Robes* and the survey will also provide a comparison of premodern

and modern women's attitudes and roles in Buddhist practice.

I briefly touched on the role of women in interpreting and disseminating Sawaki and Hashimoto's teaching on the robe, but there are several other questions about the foundations of this movement that need to be pursued. For example, my research has already revealed a pattern of association between the *kesa* and the state in Japan. Sawaki and Hashimoto recognized this ancient pattern but we need to ask how Sawaki and his followers interpreted *kesa* sewing in the context of the growing nationalism of 1930s era Japan, and how the practice has shifted to address the needs of postwar Japan. There are a number of manuals about robe sewing that will yield information about the social history of these groups. In addition, Hashimoto established robe sewing as a monastic practice at training temples and this practice is still maintained at Zuiōji. How do these monastic sewing groups compare to other groups?

Finally, Sōtō *kesa* sewing groups encourage lay men and women to sew *kesa* and wear them to their *zazen* meetings, citing Dōgen's "Merit of the Kesa" as the basis of this practice. How does this practice affect the relationship between priest and lay? Did lay people wear *kesa* and *rakusu* in the premodern period or are the portraits of secular leaders wearing these garments merely symbolic representations of their Buddhist affiliations, their status and their authority? These questions can be addressed by analyzing art, but also by examining literary works. Sung documents portray the *rakusu* as the invention of a recluse who had no official status as an ordained priest. How was this garment adopted into Japanese culture and developed into its current status as a garment for both lay and priest? Investigating this question will highlight modern tendencies toward secularism in priestly dress as well as the validation of lay men and women in contemporary Japanese Buddhism.

Implications of this Research for other Fields of Study

I initially intended to use contemporary theories of material culture and dress in my analysis, but as my research progressed I saw that Buddhist cultures had already developed a remarkably sophisticated system of understanding religious dress that could well contribute new perspectives and paradigms for these modern theories. I have argued that one cannot properly study the physical products of religious material culture without reference to the texts that prescribe these forms. This is particularly true for the Buddhist robe which has been firmly linked to texts for two millennia, and whose design is attributed to Śākyamuni Buddha. Therefore I decided to study the system first on its own terms and present an analysis based on the Japanese Buddhist perspective. With the data and interpretations presented in this research in place, it is time to return to analytic frameworks of contemporary theory, specifically material culture and dress theory.

Before using theories of material culture to understand the Buddhist robe, a further study should first clarify what we mean by material objects, and how we understand their relationship to words and actions. As a starting point, consider how the journal *Material Religion* outlines its mission:

> Material Religion seeks to explore how religion happens in material culture - images, devotional and liturgical objects, architecture and sacred space, works of art and mass-produced artifacts. No less important than these material forms are the many different practices that put them to work: Ritual, communication, ceremony, instruction, meditation, propaganda, pilgrimage, display, magic, liturgy and interpretation constitute many of the practices whereby religious material culture constructs the worlds of belief. (Accessed as of April 27, 2010 at: http://www.bergpublishers.com/BergJournals/MaterialReligion/tabid/517/Default.aspx).

What do the editors mean by the expression "religion happens in material culture"? Is there religion which exists outside the material world? Does any religion not use things like chalices, buildings, and cloth? If it does, then how would we distinguish it from philosophy? The second sentence sets up a contrast between "practices" and "material forms," implying that the reader might have made the error of valuing these material forms over practices associated with them. Is it because the power of religious objects must be restrained and shaped through practices? In this statement the terms "religion," "material culture," and "practices" are not clearly explained, although the statement seems to hint at tensions between them.

As the anthropologist Appadurai comments, "the powerful contemporary tendency is to regard the world of things as inert and mute, set in motion and animated, indeed knowable, only by persons and their words" (Appadurai 1986, 4). He argues that even in Western society, this was not always the case, suggesting that this attitude is a product of modernization. He goes on to point out that even if we believe that things are given meaning only by human activities and intentions, this fact does not help us understand the concrete historical circulation of things:

> ....we have to follow the things themselves, for their meanings are inscribed in their forms, their uses, their trajectories. It is only through the analysis of the trajectories that we can interpret the human transactions and calculations that enliven things. Thus, even though from a *theoretical* point of view human actors encode things with significance, from a *methodological* point of view it is the things-in-motion that illuminate their human and social context. (Appadurai 1986, 5; original emphasis)

This method would seem to be particularly apt for the study of religious traditions that cross cultural boundaries. Objects of religious practice accompanied the pioneers of

Buddhism in Japan, and the acceptance or rejection of these material forms was prominent in Japanese written accounts. Appadurai's distinction between theoretical and methodological perspectives means that in the work of discovery, one's methodology should be flexible enough to pursue the meaning and value of objects through time, space and cultures. Imposing a theoretical framework in which the meaning of material objects is conveyed only by words misses the illusive and fluctuating quality of their use, value and meaning.

For example, imagine visiting the Kyoto National Museum to see an exhibit of gold brocade robes. The robes are laid out flat in glass cases so that one sees only one decorated textile surface with an elaborate ring of metal or ivory attached. The accompanying explanation gives an approximate date and identifies this immense piece of fabric as a transmission robe. Is this still a garment or is it a wall hanging? How does one wear it? Who wore it? Why is it in the museum, and how has this changed its meaning? These questions are usually not addressed by the explanatory placards. A textile historian might give a partial answer to the question of its value as textile, but this tells us nothing about its religious value, and its presumably illustrious history is silenced. Even if a modicum of the object's lineage appears in the explanation, that still does not answer the critical question asked by the student of religion, namely, what is the fundamental meaning of this garment and how is it used in religious life? Is this specific robe, trapped in a museum case, still a religious object, or has this very lack of motion and performance of its religious function in fact desacralized it? Appadurai suggests that objects have careers in which their value and meaning shifts according to varying circumstances. When a religious garment changes its location through gift or exchange, there are religious, social and political forces that determine its perceived value at the moment when it moves. What happens to its value after the completion of the action?

How does its value develop through its use in ceremonies, being locked away in a storehouse and viewed infrequently, or by being used for other tasks, like covering a piano in the home of a collector?

There are also problems of authenticity and reproduction that can be usefully addressed by studying the career of the object. For example, I pointed out the mismatch between the lists of *kesa* in eighth century records of Hōryūji and the extant garments later identified as the Shōtoku and Śākyamuni *kesa*. If our only criterion for authenticity is that the extant textiles must match the written record, then we may ignore or disparage the subsequent history of these garments as the revered Shōtoku and Śākyamuni *kesa*. The same is true of texts. Even if we can demonstrate through analysis that Saichō did not write *Lamplight of the Latter Dharma*, we should not allow this discovery to obscure the fact that people believed that the text was by Saichō, and that for many centuries this belief shaped the history of the text and the understanding of Saichō as a teacher. We must not allow our modern ideas about historical authenticity to blind us to the way in which these religious objects have functioned in various times and places.

Dress theory is another field that would seem to be an appropriate category for this research. Studies in the past twenty years have addressed fashion and the body, uniforms and religious dress, and the relationship between dress and gender and globalization, to name a few topics. This research has primarily focused on aspects of dress and identity in modern and postmodern perspectives, with very few studies of premodern dress. More studies of premodern phenomena would help to balance the overdependence on modern notions of identity and secularism. For example, in Buddhism the robe is a manifestation of the Buddha's teaching that goes beyond individual identity. When one dons the robe, individual identity drops away and one becomes part of the Buddha's clan. This notion of identity could provide a useful counter

example to modern studies which rely on identity as the performance of individuality.

The modern concept of identity may be such an inherent aspect of dress theory, however, that it cannot be easily used for analyzing premodern dress. This problem is illustrated by an article by Lefferts on the form of Buddhist robes as "cut-and-sewn" garments (Lefferts 1991, 44-55). In Thai society males wear uncut cloth and women wear garments that are cut and sewn. How does the cut-and-sewn Buddhist robe fit in this social system? Although Lefferts refers to Buddhist teachings about the robe, he does not integrate them in his argument, keeping instead to his gender analysis. He misinterprets the "field pattern" of the robe as evidence that the monks symbolically linked themselves to the secular world through this design, completely missing the metaphor of the robe as a "field of merit." In this case, applying the comparative framework stunts a deeper understanding of the garment.

I have mentioned several points in the dissertation that would be appropriate for art history investigations. Projects that analyze the religious meaning of how Buddhist robes are depicted in paintings and sculpture would in turn help textile historians to understand the religious aspects of the textile artifacts that they study. An important aspect of this analysis would be to understand how the robes wrap around the body and move with the body in ceremonies. The robe is part of a moving performance of religious practice that must be learned, and artistic depictions of *kesa* on statues and in paintings are far more than depictions of cloth drapery. The robes are the visible form of the charisma of the teacher, a principle that the Buddhist tradition has expressed in texts, in garments and in art. When this kind of analysis of art and artifact is undertaken, we will begin to understand more clearly that the faces depicted in a portrait may give us insight into these individual Buddhist teachers, but the articulate robes tell us even more about who they were in the eyes of their followers.

My approach developed directly out of these materials and the writings of Buddhist teachers who used art, artifacts, and texts to construct their own interpretation of the religious meaning of the robe. They carefully examined even the smallest details in the belief that the practice of the robe was the expression of the Buddha's body and mind. For these teachers the robe was not a symbol of the *Buddhadharma*; rather it was seen as the living act of the Buddha. To understand the full impact of this point of view we must guard against our tendency to separate the physical from the spiritual when studying religious thought and practice. To paraphrase Appadurai, my methodological approach followed the shifting values of Buddhist robes in motion as they were sewn, washed, sculpted, given, stolen, displayed, hidden away, and passed on as a token of mind-to-mind transmission. I used an interdisciplinary approach to uncover the dynamics of how the robe functions in Japanese Buddhist culture, just as the tradition itself uses all available materials. Using this approach has enabled me to see in this case of the Buddhist robe how the collective and individual religious imagination creates a sanctified world in the intersection of the material and the spiritual.

---

1. Okamoto Kōbun, who ran semi-annual *kesa* sewing retreats for thirty years, expresses this sentiment in her unpublished handbook, "Making rag robes" (*Funzōe o tsukuru* 糞掃衣を作る). I also addressed this issue in my discussion of the aesthetic training of *kesa* sewing participants (Riggs 2004).

Works Cited

Primary Sources

Arguments for the Southern Mountain Vinaya School Prohibition of Silk Kesa. Ueda Shōhen 上田正遍 (1828-1908) in 1880. *Nanzan risshū kesa kinken junshō ron* 南山律宗袈裟禁絹順正論, DNB vol. 74.

Brahmā Net Sūtra. See *Fanwang jing* 梵網經, T no. 1484.

Lamplight of the Latter Dharma. See *Mappō Tōmyōki* 末法燈明記. Edited by Matsubara Yūzen 松原祐善 in *Mappō Tōmyōki no kenkyū* 末法燈明記の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1978.

Chapter on Buddhist Vestments. Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667). See *Shimen zhang fuyi* 釋門章服儀, T no. 1894.

Chapter on Elephant Trunk Transmission Robe. Gyakusui Tōryū 逆水洞流 (1684-1766) in 1759. See *Den'e zōbi shōkō* 傳衣象鼻章稿, published as *Den'e Zōbi shō haka* 傳衣象鼻章巴歌 with commentary by Daisen Tamashū 大泉玉州 (1739-1814) in 1808, ZSSZ Shingi, vol. 2.

Collected Tales of Times Now Past. See *Konjaku monogatari-shū* 今昔物語集, NKBT vols. 22-24. Edited by Yamada Yoshio 山田孝雄.

Collection of Sand and Pebbles. Mujū Ichien 無住一円 (1226-1312) in 1279-1283. See *Shasekishū* 沙石集, NKBT vol. 85. Edited by Watanabe Tsunaya 渡邊綱也.

Compassionate Lotus Scripture. See *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka sūtra*; *Peihua jing* 悲華經, T no. 157.

Compilation of the Proper Deportment of Buddhist Robes. Hōtan 鳳潭 (1654-1738) in 1717. See *Butsumon efuku shōgihen* 佛門衣服正儀編, DNB vol. 73.

Critique of Compilation of the Proper Deportment of Buddhist Robes. Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718-1804) in 1750. See *Butsumon ebuku shōgihen hyōshaku* 佛門衣服正儀篇評釈, JSZ vol. 3.

Critique of "Questions about Ordination." Gyakusui Tōryū 逆水洞流 (1684-1766) in 1764. See *Tokudo wakumon bengi shō* 得度或門辨儀章, ZSSZ Zenkai, vol. 1.

Deep Meaning of the Field of Merit. Sokō Raizen 祖光来禅 (1795 - ?) in 1825. See *Fukuden taisui* 福田滯邃. In *Sōtō shū kesa no chishiki* 曹洞宗袈裟の知識. Kawaguchi Kōfū 川口高風. Tokyo: Sōtō shū shūmuchō, 1984.

Dictionary of Historical Terms. See *Kojiruien* 古事類苑. Compiled by Hosokawa Junjirō 細川潤次郎, et al. Tokyo: Koji ruien kankō-kai, 1931-1936.

Five Part Vinaya (*Mahīśāsaka Vinaya*). See *Wufen lü* 五分律, T nos. 1421-1424.

Four Part Vinaya (*Dharmaguptaka Vinaya*). See *Sifen lü* 四分律, T no. 1428.

Four Part Vinaya Practice and Service Comments. Daoxuan 道宣 (596-667). See *Sifen lü shanfan buque xingshi chao* 四分律刪繁補闕行事鈔, T no. 1804.

Great Song Compendium of Monastic History. Zanning 賛寧 (919-1001). See *Da Song Seng shi lü* 大宋僧史略, T no. 2126.

Guide to Six Possessions of Buddhist Monks. Yuanzhao 元照 (1048-1116). See *Fozhi biqui liuwu tu* 佛制比丘六物圖, T no. 1900.

Guidelines for Dharma Robes of Buddhist Monks. Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769) in 1768. See *Shakushi hōe kun* 釋氏法衣訓, ZSSZ Shingi, vol. 2.

Handbook of Ancient Matters of Ikaruga Temple. Kakuken 覺賢 (fl. 1836). See *Ikarugadera koji benran* 斑鳩寺古事便覧, DNB 117.

Illustrated Standard of Garments of the Way. Jiun Onkō (1718-1804) in 1751. See *Ryakubon Hōbuku zugi* 畧本方服圖儀 and *Kōhon hōbuku zugi* 廣本方服圖儀, JSZ vol. 1.

Illustrations of Hōryūji Objects. See *Hōryūji jūmotsu zu* 法隆寺什物図. 1843. In Sawada Mutsuyo 澤田むつ代. *Jōdai gire shūsei: kofun shutsudo no sen'i seihin kara Hōryūji Shōsōin gire made* 上代裂集成：古墳出土の繊維製品から法隆寺・正倉院裂まで. Tokyo: Chūō kōron bijutsu shuppan, 2001.

Forest of Pearls in the Garden of the Dharma. Compiled by Daoshi 道世 (?-683) in 668. See *Fayuan zhulin* 法苑珠林, T no. 2122.

Journey to the East of the Great Master of the Tang. Sitou 思託 (fl. 750). Edited by Ōmi no Mifune 淡海三船 (722-785). See *Tōdai wajō tōseiden* 唐大和上東征傳, T no. 2089.7.

Legends of Hōryūji Monastery and a Record of the History of its Treasures. See *Hōryūji garan engi narabini ryūki shizai chō* 法隆寺伽藍縁起並流記資財帳, DNB vol. 117.

Mahāsāṅghika Vinaya. See *Mahesengqi lü* 摩訶僧祇律, T nos. 1425-1427.

Manual for Buddhist Monks. Daocheng 道誠 (fl. 1019). See *Shizhi yaolan* 釋氏要覽, T no. 2127.

Mulasarvāstivāda Vinaya. See *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu lü* 根本説一切有部律, T nos. 1442-1459.

Nara hakurankai motsuhin mokuroku 奈良博覧会物品目録. 1876. In Sawada Mutsuyo. 澤田むつ代 *Jōdai retsu (gire) shūsei: kofun shutsudo no sen'i seihin kara Hōryūji Shōsōin retsu (gire) made* 上代裂集成：古墳出土の繊維製品から法隆寺・正倉院裂まで Tokyo: Chūō kōron bijutsu shuppan, 2001.

Nihon shoki 日本書紀. In NKBT vol. 67, 68. Edited by Sakamoto Tarō 坂本太郎.

Proper Dharma Attire. Mokushitsu Ryōyō 黙室良要 (1775-1833) in 1821. See *Hōbuku kakushō* 法服格正, ZSSZ Shingi, vol. 2.

Pure Rules for Chan monasteries. Compiled by *Changlu Zongze* 長蘆宗 in 1103. See Chanyuan qinggui 禪苑清規. Edited by Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆, et al. In *Yakuchū Zennen shingi* 訳注禪苑清規. Tokyo: Sōtōshū Shūmuchō, 1972.

Questions about Ordination. Menzan Zuihō 面山瑞方 (1683-1769) in 1763. See *Tokudo waku mon* 得度或問, SSZ Zenkai, vol. 3.

Record of Eastern Treasures. Compiled by Gōhō 果宝 (1306-1362). See *Tōbōki* 東宝記, ZZGR Shūkyō, vol. 12.

Record of Imports. Kūkai 空海 (774-835). See *Goshōrai mokuroku* 御請來目録, T no. 2161.

Record of Inner Dharma from the Southern Sea. Yijing 義淨 (635-713). See *Nanhai jigui neifa zhuan* 南海寄歸内法傳, T no. 2125.

Record of Miraculous Manifestations of the Karmic Result of Good and Bad [actions]. Compiled by Kyōkai 景戒 (fl. 820) in 822. See *Nihon koku genpō zen'aku ryōiki* 日本国現報善悪霊異記, NKBT vol. 70. Edited by Endō Yoshimoto 遠藤嘉基.

Record of Sewing One Thousand Robes. Gomyō Kinshi 護明謹志 (1734-1780), et al. See *Hōe hotsugan saisei no bo* 法衣發願裁製之簿, also as *Sen'e saisei bo* 千衣裁製之簿, JSZ vol. 16.

Record of the Transmission of the Lamp. Compiled by Daoyuan 道原 in 1004. See *Jingde zhuan deng lu* 景徳傳燈録, T no. 2076.

Record of Western Lands in the Great Tang. Xuanzang 玄奘 (602-664). See *Da Tang xiyu zhi* 大唐西域記, T no. 2087.

Rules for Practice. Dōgen (1200-1253). See *Bendōhō* 辨道法 in DZZ vol. 2.

Scripture of Cause and Effect in the Past and Present. See *Guoqu xianzai yinguo xing* 過去現在因縁經, T no. 189.

Scripture of Great Māya. See *Mo ho mo yeh jing* 摩訶摩耶經, T no. 383.

Scripture of Immeasurable Life. See *Sukhāvatīvyūha; FoshuoWuliangshou jing* 佛説無量壽經, T no. 360.

Scripture of Wise and Foolish. See *Xianyu jing* 賢愚經, T no. 202.

Scripture of Ten Wheels. See (*Dafang guang*) *shilun jing* (大方廣)十輪經, T no. 410.

Selections from the Record of Past and Present Legends of Prince Shōtoku. Kenshin 顯眞 (c.1227-1262). See *Shōtoku taishi den kokon mokuroku shō* 聖徳太子伝古今目録抄. In Ogino Minahiko 荻野三七彦. *Shōtoku Taishi den kokon mokuroku sho no kisoteki kenkyū* 聖徳太子伝古今目録書の基礎的研究. Tokyo: Morie shoten, 1980.

Sāṁyuktāgama. See *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經, T no. 99.

Record of the Investigation of Shōtoku Taishi's Kesa. Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718-1804) in 1756. See *Shōtoku Taishi kesa kenshōki* 聖徳太子袈裟驗證記, JSZ vol. 1.

Shining Deportment of Silk Robes. Dōkō 道光 (f. 1762) in 1762. See *Sōe kōgi* 繪衣光儀, DNB vol. 73.

Ten Recitation Vinaya (*Sārvāstivāda Vinaya*). See *Shisong lü* 十誦律, T nos. 1435-1437.

Thoughts on the Kesa of the Buddhas and Ancestors. Tokugon Yōson 徳厳養存 (? - 1703) in 1703. See *Busso kesa kō* 佛祖袈裟考, ZSSZ Shingi, vol. 2.

Treasury of the True Dharma Eye. Dōgen 道元 (1200-1253). See*Shōbō genzō* 正法眼藏, DZZ vol. 1.

Verses on Garments of the Way. Attributed to Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718-1804). See *Hōbuku kansan* 法服歌讃, JSZ vol. 1.

Vibhāṣāvinaya. See *Shian jian lü pi po sha* 善見律毘婆沙, T no. 1462.

Vinaya Characteristics Revelations. See *Lüxiang gantong zhuan* 律相感通傳, T no. 1898.

Yuan era Revision of Baizhang Zen Monastic Regulations. Compiled by Dongyang Dehui 東陽德輝 (fl. 1330) in 1338. See *Chixiu Baizhang qinggui* 敕修百丈清規, T no. 2025.

Secondary Sources

Akiyama Terukazu, ed. 秋山光和. Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu. 源色日本の美術. Tokyo: Tokyo shogakkan, 1966-1972.

Andō Kōsei 安藤更生. *Ganjin wajō* 鑑真和尚. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbun kan, 1971 (1967).

Appadurai, Arjun, ed. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Asano Kiyoshi 浅野清. *Nara no jiin to Tenpyō chōkoku.* 奈良の寺院と天平彫刻. Genshoku Nihon no bijutsu 3. Tokyo: Tokyo shōgakkan, 1981.

Aston, W.G. *Nihongi: Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to A.D. 697.* London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1956 (1896).

Bodiford, William M. *Sōtō Zen in Medieval Japan*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism 8. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1993.

------. ed. *Going Forth: Visions of Buddhist Vinaya*. Studies in East Asian Buddhism 18. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005.

Brinker, Helmut and Kanazawa Hiroshi. *Zen Masters of Meditation in Images and Writings*. Vol. Supplementum 40. Zurich: *Artibus Asiae*, 1996.

Chang Kun. *A Comparative Study of the Kaṭhinavastu.* Indo-Iranian monographs 1. Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957.

Clarke, Shayne. "Miscellaneous Musings on Mūlasarvāstivāda Monks: The Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Revival in Tokugawa Japan." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 33 (1 2006): 1-49.

De Bary, Wm. Theodore et al, ed. *Sources of Japanese Tradition*. New York: Columbia, 2001.

De Visser, Marinus Willem. *Ancient Buddhism in Japan: Sūtras in Use in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries A. D. and Their History in Later Times.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1935.

Dykstra, Yoshiko Kurata. *The Konjaku Tales: from a Medieval Japanese Collection*. Osaka: Intercultural Research Institute, 1986.

Fisher Robert E. *Buddhist Art and Architecture.* Thames and Hudson, 1993.

Forte, Antonino. "On the Origin of the Purple *Kaṣāya* in China." In *Buddhist Asia 1* (2001): 145-166.

Gómez, Luis O. *Land of Bliss: The Paradise of the Buddha of Measureless Light: Sanskrit and Chinese Versions of the Sukhāvatīvyūha Sutras*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1996.

Grapard, Allan G. *The Protocol of the Gods: A Study of the Kasuga Cult in Japanese History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Groner, Paul. *Saichō: The Establishment of the Japanese Tendai School.* Seoul: Po Chin Chai, 1984.

Hall, John Whitney. "Terms and Concepts in Japanese Medieval History: An Inquiry into the Problems of Translation." *Journal of Japanese Studies* 9 (1983): 1-32.

Hashimoto Ekō 橋本恵光. Kokusaku sen o iku sōfuku shintaisei 国策線を行く僧服新体制. *Dōgen* (November 1940): 19-24.

------. Hōbuku kakushō kōwa 法服格正講話. *Dōgen* (March 1940): 15-20; (May 1940): 27-32; (June 1940): 27-32.

------. *Daijō honshō shinji kangyō: muku shōhin ge hōe jūshō ri* 大乗本生心地観経、無垢性品偈法衣十勝利. Nagoya: Kaizenji, 1967.

Hashimoto Ekō. *Kyō jukai bun teisho* 教授会文提唱. Tokyo: Kokusho kangō kai, 1999.

Henderson, Gregory and Leon Hurvitz. "The Buddha of Seiryōji: New Finds and New Theory." *Artibus Asiae* 19 (1 1956): 5-55.

Higuchi Hideo. "The Public Display of the Treasures from the Hōryūji in the Edo Period, (II) with special reference to the donated boxes for seven articles of the Treasures." *Museum: Tokyo kokuritsu hakubutsu kan bijutsu shi* 339 (June 1979): 29-34.

Hirakubo Akira 平久保章, ed. Ingen zenshū 隱元全集. Tokyo: Kaimyō soin, 1979.

Holt, John C. *Discipline: The Canonical Buddhism of the Vinayapiṭaka*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1991.

Hōryūji shōwa shizaichō hensanjo tankōsha. 法隆寺 昭和資財帳編纂所 たんこう舎. *Hōryūji shiryō shūsei: eiinbon.* 法隆寺史料集成：影印本. Vols. 1, 15. Tokyo: Wakō bijutsu shuppan, 1983-1985.

Inoue Tadashi. 井上正 "Ganjin wajō zō josetsu" 鑑真和上像序説. *Museum* 314 (1977): 17-26.

Ishida Mosaku 石田茂作. *Shōtoku taishi sonzō shusei* 聖徳太子尊像聚成. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1976.

Ishikawa Rikizan 石川力山. "Chūsei Sōtōshū kirigami no bunrui shikiron: 6" 中世曹洞宗切紙の分類式論. *Komazawa Daigaku Bukkyō gakubu ronshū* 16 (1985): 102-152.

Ishikawa Rikizan. "Dōgen Zen to Jōdo kyō shisō: rinjū shōnen to *Hikekyō* no inyō o megutte" 道元禅と浄土教思想：臨終正念と「悲華經」の引用をめぐって. *Indo Bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 40 (1992): 751-757.

------. "Shaka shinkō to Dōgen Zen" 釈迦信仰と道元禅. *Indo Bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 44 (1995): 229-234.

Izutsu Gafu 井筒画風. Kesa shi 袈裟史. Kyoto: Bunka jihosha, 1965.

------. *Hōeshi* 法衣史. Tokyo: Yūzan kaku, 1974.

Kagamishima Genryū 鏡島元隆. "Koki fukko undō to sono shisōteki haikei 古規復古運動と其思想的背景. *Dōgen Zenji to Sōtō shū*, ed. Kawamura Kōdō and Ishikawa Rikizan. 155-168. 7. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, [1978] 1985.

Kanda, Christine Guth. "Kaikei's Statue of Hachiman in Tōdaiji." *Artibus Asiae* 43 (1981): 190-208.

Kawaguchi Kōfū 川口高風. *Hōbuku kakushō no kenkyū* 法服格正の研究. Tokyo: Daiichi Shobō, 1976.

------. *Sōtō shū no kesa no chishiki - Fukuden taisui ni yotte* 曹洞宗の袈裟の知識：「福田滞すい」によって. Tokyo: Sōtō shū shumuchō, 1984.

------. "Dōgen zenji no kesa shinkō to kairitsu." In *Dōgen shisō taikei* 9, edited by Kosaka Kiyū 小坂機融. Dōmei sha shuppan, 1995 (1974): 100-114.

------."Meiji, Taishō ki ni okeru Sōtō shū no tōgesa hō" 明治．大正期における宗洞宗の塔袈裟法. *Journal of Sōtō Zen Studies* 43 (2001): 233-238.

------. "Shashin yori mita kindai Sōtōshū no tōgesa hō" 写真より見た近代曹洞宗の塔袈裟法. *Aichi Gakuin Daigaku kyoikubu kiyō* 49 (2002): 158-135.

Kawamura Kōdō 河村孝道. "Shōbō genzō" 正法眼藏. In Dōgen no chosaku, ed. Kagamishima Genryū and Tamaki Kōjirō. 1-73. 3. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, 1980.

Kim Jongmyung. "Buddhist Rituals in Medieval Korea (918-1392)." UCLA, 1994.

Kirihata Takeshi 切畑健. "Shichijō shi nōgesa to shi nōe" 七条刺納袈裟と刺納衣. *Tendai bijutsu no shōsō: Kenkyū happyō to zadankai* 16 (1988): 1-3.

Kirino Kōgaku 桐野好覚. "*Shōbōgenzō* ni inyō sareru *Hikekyō* to *Shaka Nyorai gohyaku taigan* ni tsuite" 「正法眼藏」に引用される「悲華経」と釋迦如来五百大願について. *Sōtō shū Shūgaku kenkyūjo kiyō* 29 (1998): 73-89.

Kiuchi Takeo and Sawada Mutsuyo 木内武男、沢田みつ代. "Hōryūji ken'nō hōmotsu "funzōe" ni tsuite" 法隆寺献納宝物「糞掃衣」について. *Museum* 332 .12 (1978): 4-14.

Kornicki, Peter F. "Public Display and Changing Values: Early Meiji Exhibitions and their Precursors." *Monumenta Nipponica* 49 (1994): 167-196.

Kuroda Shintō 黒田眞洞 and Mochizuki Shinkō 望月信亨, ed. *Hōnen Shōnin Zenshū* 法然上人全書. Kyoto: Sosuisha, 1911.

Kyoto Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 京都国立博物館, ed. *Saichō to Tendai no kokuhō* 最澄と天台の国宝. Kyoto: Yomiuri Shinbun, 2005.

Kyūma Echū 久馬慧忠. *Kesa no kenkyū* 袈裟の研究. Tokyo: Daihorinkaku, 1967.

------. *Kesa no hanashi; hotoke no kokoro to katachi* 袈裟の話し：ほとけの心と形. Kyoto: Hozokan, 1989.

Lancaster, Lewis R. *Korean Buddhist Canon: A Descriptive Catalogue.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Lefferts, H. Leedom. "Cut and Sewn: The Textiles of Social Organization in Thailand." In *Dress and Gender: Making and Meaning in Cultural Contexts*. Edited by Ruth Barnes and Joanne B. Eicher. Oxford: Berg, 1992:44-53.

Lyman, Marie. "Distant Mountains: The Influence of *Funzō-e* on the Tradition of Buddhist Clerical Robes in Japan." *Textile Museum Journal* 23 (1984): 26-41.

Marra, Michele. "The Conquest of Mappō: Jien and Kitabatake Chikafusa." *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies* 12 (1985): 319-341.

Matsubara Yūzen 松原祐善. Mappō Tōmyōki *no kenkyū* 「末法燈明記」の研究. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1978.

Matsumura Kaoruko 松村薫子. "Funzōe no kenkyū" 糞掃衣の研究. *Bunka ronshū* 8 (1998), 12-50.

Mayo, Janet. *A History of Ecclesiastical Dress*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1984.

McArthur, Meher. *Reading Buddhist Art.* New York: Thames and Hudson, 2002.

McCallum, Donald F. "The Earliest Buddha Statues in Japan." *Artibus Asiae* 61 (2001): 149-188.

McDermott, Hiroko T. "The Hōryūji Treasures and Early Meiji Cultural Policy." *Monumenta Nipponica* 61 (2006): 339-374.

Mills, D. E. *A Collection of Tales from Uji: A Study and Translation of Uji Shūi Monogatari*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Miner, Earl R., Hiroko Odagiri, and Robert E Morrell. *Princeton Companion to Classical Japanese Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Misaki Ryōshu 三崎良周. "Shinbutsu shūgō shisō to Hikekyō" 神仏習合思想と悲華經. IBK 9 (1961): 16-20.

Mizuno Yaoko 水野弥穂子. *Dōgen Zenji no okesa* 道元禅師のお袈裟. Tokyo: Hakujusha, 1987.

Mizuno Yaoko. "*Hikekyō* to Dōgen zenji no okesa" 悲華經と道元禅師のお袈裟. *Dōgen shisō taikei* 9, edited by Kosaka Kiyū 小坂機融. Tokyo: Dōmei sha shuppan (1995): 115-124.

Mohr, Michel. "Electronic Text of the Genkō Shakusho by Kōkan Shiren." Kyoto: International Research Institute for Zen Buddhism, 2001. Availlable as of June 10, 2010 at: http://iriz.hanazono.ac.jp/frame/data/f00d5_009.html

Morohashi Tetsuji 諸橋轍次. *Dai Kanwa jiten* 大漢和辭典. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten, 1957.

Morrell, Robert E. *Sand and Pebbles: The Tales of Mujū Ichien, A Voice for Pluralism in Kamakura Buddhism*. Albany: SUNY, 1985.

Nakamura Hajime, ed. 中村元. *Bukkyō jiten*. 仏教辞典. Second edition. Tokyo: Iwanami shōten, 2002 [1989].

Nakamura Sōichi 中村宗一. Shōbōgenzō zenyaku 正法眼藏全訳. Tokyo: Seishin shobō, 1972.

Narita Teikan 成田貞寛. "Shaka nyōrai gohyaku taigan kyō no seiritsu" 釋迦如來五百大願經の成立. JIABS 13 (1965): 548-558.

Nattier Jan. *Once Upon a Future Time: Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline*. Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press, 1991.

Nakanishi Seiō 中西誠應. *Gazō shuchi* 畫像須知. Japan: unknown, 1848.

Nara Rokudaiji Taikan Kankōkai 奈良六大寺大観刊行會. *Nara Rokudaiji taikan* 奈良六大寺大觀. 14 vols. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1999-2001.

Nomura Takumi 野村卓美. "*Hikekyō* to Chūsei bungaku: *Hikekyō* to *Shaka nyorai gohyaku taigan* o megutte" 「非華経」と中世文学：「悲華經」と「釋迦如來五百大願」をめぐって. *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 70 (1993): 30-43.

Nomura Takumi. "*Hikekyō* to setsuwa bungaku" 「悲華經」と説話文学. *Setsuwa bungaku kenkyū* 31 (1996): 85-95.

Ogino Minahiko 荻野三七彥. *Shōtoku Taishi den kokon mokuroku sho no kisoteki kenkyū* 聖徳太子伝古今目録書の基礎的研究. Tokyo: Morie shoten, 1980.

Ono Genmyō 小野玄妙. Bussho kaisetsu dai jiten 佛書解説大辭典. Tokyo: Daitō Shuppan, 1933-36, 1974.

Osaka shiritsu bijutsu kan 大阪市立美術館. *Shotoku Taishi shinkō no bijutsu* 聖徳太子信仰の美術. Osaka: Tōhō shuppan, 1996.

------. 大阪市立美術館 Kokoro no sho Jiun Sonja. 心の書：慈雲尊者 Osaka: Yomiuri Shinbun, 2004.

Piggott, Joan R. "Mokkan: Wooden Documents from the Nara Period." *Monumenta Nipponica* 45, no. 4 (Winter) (1990): 449-470.

Powell, William F. *Record of Tung-shan.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1986.

Prebish, Charles S. *Buddhist Monastic Discipline.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1974.

Quinter, David. "Creating Bodhisattvas: Eison, *Hinin*, and the "Living Mañjuśri"." *Monumenta Nipponica* 62 (2007): 437-458.

Rambelli, Fabio. "The Emperor's New Robes: Processes of Resignification in Shingon Imperial Rituals." *Cahiers d'Extreme-Asie* 13 (2002): 427-453.

Rhodes, Robert F. "Saichō's *Mappō Tōmyōki*: *The Candle of the Latter Dharma*." *The Eastern Buddhist* 13 (1980): 79-103.

Riggs, David. "The Rekindling of a Tradition: Menzan Zuihō and the Reform of Japanese Sōtō Zen in the Tokugawa Era." University of California, 2002.

Riggs, Diane E. "Fukudenkai: Sewing the Buddha's Robe in Contemporary Japanese Buddhist practice." JJRS 31, no. 2 (2004): 315-360.

Ruppert, Brian D. *Jewel in the Ashes: Buddha Relics and Power in Early Medieval Japan*. Harvard University Press, 2000.

Sawa Ryūken 佐和隆研. *Tōji: mitsubō* 東寺：密宝, vol. 6. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1969.

Sawada Mutsuyo 澤田むつ代. *Jōdai gire shūsei: kofun shutsudo no sen'i seihin kara Hōryūji Shōsōin gire made* 上代裂集成：古墳出土の繊維製品から法隆寺・正倉院裂まで. Tokyo: Chūō kōron bijutsu shuppan, 2001.

Sawaki Kōdō 澤木興道. "Ehō ichinyo" 衣法一如. *Komadai gakuhō* 6 (1936).

------. "Okesa no hanashi." お袈裟の話し. In *Zendan* 禅談. Tokyō: Daihōrinkaku, 1938.

------. *Zen ni ikiru* 禅に生きる. Tokyo: Seishin shobō, 1956.

------. "Hōbuku kakushō kōwa" 法服格正講話. *Daihōrin* (1976-1979).

Schopen, Gregory. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2004.

------. "Cross-Dressing with the Dead: Asceticism, Ambivalence, and Institutional Values in an Indian Monastic Code." In *The Buddhist Dead: Practices, Discourses, Representations*, edited by Bryan J. Cuevas and Jacqueline I. Stone. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2007.

Sekiguchi Dōjun 関口道潤. *Nihon Sōtō shu shoki kyōdan ni okeru hōe no kenkyū* 日本曹洞宗初期教團における法衣の研究. Ichinomiya: Eirinji, 1992.

Sekito Genpō 関戸元峯. *Busso ehō* 佛祖衣法. Osaka: Hokkeji, 1934.

Sharf, Robert H. "The Idolization Of Enlightenment - On The Mummification Of Ch'an Masters In Medieval China." *History of Religions* 32 (1992): 1-31.

Shinohara, Koichi. "The Kaṣāya Robe of the Past Buddha Kāṣyapa in the Miraculous Instruction Given to the Vinaya Master Daoxuan (596-667)." *Chung-Hwa Buddhist Journal* 13 (2000): 299-367.

Shōsōin jimusho 正倉院事務所. *Shōsōin hōmotsu*. 正倉院宝物. Tokyo: Asahi shinbun, 1960-1964.

Silk, Jonathan A. "Dressed for Success: the Monk Kāśyapa and Strategies of Legitimation in Earlier Mahāyāna Buddhist Scriptures." *Journal Asiatique* 291 (1-2 2003): 173-219.

Stone, Jacqueline I. "Seeking Enlightenment in the Last Age: *Mappō* Thought in Kamakura Buddhism." *Eastern Buddhist* 18 (1 and 2 1985): 28-56; 35-64.

Sugano Ryūichi 菅野隆一. "Shinran to *Hikekyō*" 親鸞と「悲華經」. *Indo Bukkyō gaku kenkyū* 36 (1 1987): 161-163.

Sugiyama Jirō. *Classic Buddhist Sculpture: The Tempyō Period.* Edited by Samuel Crowel Morse. San Francisco: Kodansha, 1982 (1967).

Tamamuro Fumio 圭室文雄. *Zusetsu Nihon bukkyō no rekishi: Edo jidai* 図説日本仏教の歴史：江戸時代. Tokyo: Hyōronsha, 1996.

Tanaka Tadao 田中忠雄. *Sawaki Kōdō: kono koshin no hito* 澤木興道この古心の人. Tokyo: Sankyō bijutsu insatsu, 1990.

Tokuda Myōbon 徳田明本. "Risshū bunken mokuroku." 律宗文献目録. In *Bukkyō kyōdan no kenkyū*, ed. Yoshimura Shūki. Kyoto: Hyakka en, 1968.

Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan 東京国立博物館. *Hōryūji ken'nō hōmotsu* 法隆寺献納宝物. Kyoto: Benridō, 1975.

Tokyo Kokuritsu Hakubutsukan. *Ancient Buddhist Treasures of Kōfukuji Temple: In Commemoration of the Completion of the Heisei-era Grand Repairs of the Nan'endō Hall.* Tokyo: Tokyo National Museum, 1997.

Tomomatsu Entai 友松圓諦. *Bukkyō ni okeru bunpai no riron to jissai* 仏教における分配の理論と実際. Tokyo: Shunjū sha, 1965.

Ueda Reijō 上田霊城. "Edo Bukkyō no kairitsu shisō" 江戸仏教の戒律思想. *Mikkyō bunka* 116 (1976): 24-40.

Ujitani Yūken 宇治谷祐顕. *Hikekyō no Jōdo* 悲華經の浄土. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten, 1977.

Wayman, Alex and Hideko. *Lion's Roar of Queen Srimala.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.

Williams, Duncan. ""Re-presentations" of Zen: An Institutional and Social History of Sōtō Zen Buddhism in Edo Japan." Harvard University, 2000.

Wilson, William R. "*Konjaku monogatari*." *Monumenta Nipponica* 28 (Summer 1976): 177-233.

Yamada Isshi. *Karuṇāpuṇḍarīka.* London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1968.

Yamamoto Isao 山本勇夫, ed. Saijarin 摧邪輪. In *Kōsō meicho zenshū*, vol. 9. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1930-1931.

Yokoi Yūhō. *Shōbōgenzō.* Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book-store, 1986.

Yoneda Yūsuke 米田雄介. *Shōsōin hōmotsu no rekishi to hozon* 正倉院宝物の歴史と保存. Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 1998.

Zhang Wenbin, ed. *Dunhuang: a Centennial Commemoration of the Discovery of the Cave Library*. Beijing: Morning Glory Publishers, 2000.